

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1888.

WE have much pleasure in announcing that arrangements have been made with Messrs. GINN, of Boston, the well-known Classical publishers and booksellers, which will enable us to enlarge the Review by an additional sheet, commencing January, 1889, so as to allow more space for contributions from American scholars. Professor SEYMOUR of Yale, Professor J. H. WRIGHT of Harvard, and Professor W. G. HALE, of the Johns Hopkins University, have most kindly consented to act as an Editorial Committee for the United States.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE SOLONIAN LEGISLATION.

WE may accept, not as fixed dates, but as ordinary data of the present inquiry, the following chronology:—

- B.C. 639. Damasias archon.
- 594. Solon archon.
- 586. Damasias (2) archon.
- 570. Amasis King of Egypt.
- 560. Croesus King of Lydia.

When archon, Solon passed the Seisachtheia (Plut. *Sol.* 14-15). Then, according to Plutarch, followed an interval, during which both upper and lower classes were discontented with the mere relief of debts; the former, because Solon had gone so far; the latter, because he had not gone further to the re-division of property. But when both classes found that he was really right, they appointed him legislator, not in part, but in the whole constitution (Plut. *Sol.* 16). Thus Plutarch distinguishes two legislations of Solon, (1) his Seisachtheia, (2) his General Legislation. The Seisachtheia occurred in Solon's archonship. What was the date of his general legislation?

The ordinary account, which seems to emanate from Sosicrates (cp. Diog. Laert. 1, 62), places Solon's general legislation in his archonship, B.C. 594. But it does not distinguish the

general legislation from the Seisachtheia. Now it is probable that this confusion had not yet arisen even so late as the time of Demosthenes, who in B.C. 343 (*De Fals. Leg.* p. 420, § 251), places the era of Solon 240 years back, that is, not in 594, but in 583. But the nearest authority to Solon's time dates his laws even later. Herodotus (2, 177) in a passage, which has strangely escaped the notice of historians, says that Solon borrowed his law against idleness from Amasis, King of Egypt. He must, therefore, have believed that Solon legislated after the accession of Amasis, which, by a general agreement of Greek and Egyptian sources, took place about 570. On the strength, then, of the authority of Herodotus, far preferable to that of Demosthenes, Sosicrates, and all the later chronologists put together, it is most probable that Solon's general legislation occurred, not in 594, nor in 583, but after 570 B.C.

This distinction between the Seisachtheia in 594 and the general legislation after 570 explains, as no other hypothesis can, the time and circumstances of the revolution in the archonship, which is described in the papyrus found on an Egyptian mummy and now deposited at Berlin. Without filling

up the lacunae of this papyrus, we at least learn from it that, at the time of the archonship of Damasias, there was a movement to open the office beyond the ranks of the Eupatridae, by taking some of the archons from other parts of the community. But the question arises—which Damasias? On the one hand, the hypothesis that the papyrus refers to the archonship of Damasias in 639 is rendered extremely difficult by the mention of the remission of debts (τῇ[τῶν] χρεῶν ἀποκοπήν), which at once suggests Solon's Seisachtheia in 594; while a sedition about the archonship is equally suggestive of his legislative enactments about that office. On the other hand, the hypothesis that it is the archonship of Damasias in 586 has hitherto seemed still more difficult, because it has been assumed that Solon's general legislation had already taken the archonship from the Eupatridae in 594, which would have rendered a revolution in 586 quite unnecessary.

But, as we have seen, Solon's general legislation did not occur in 594, but after 570. In 586 he had not yet touched the archonship. There might therefore be a movement in the direction of opening it more widely. We must distinguish three stages: first, in 594, Solon being archon passed the Seisachtheia; secondly, followed a period of discontent; thirdly, after 570 Solon was made general legislator, and then deprived the Eupatridae of the archonship. If so, nothing is more likely than that, in the interval of discontent, a revolutionary movement was arising against the Eupatridae, who still monopolized the archonship, and nothing more natural than that the lower classes should appeal to the remission of debts. Probably, therefore, the archonship of Damasias in the papyrus was not that of 639, but that of 586; and accordingly the revolution, described in the papyrus, was posterior to Solon's Seisachtheia in 594, but prior to his general legislation after 570. In this case, the opening of the archonship was a gradual process of Solon's time, in which a revolutionary movement to extend the office beyond the ranks of the Eupatridae, by taking some of the archons

from the lower orders, was a preliminary step towards Solon's legislative enactment, transferring the entire office from the Eupatridae to all citizens in his first three classes, by altering the qualification from birth to wealth.

Before the papyrus was published, I had adopted the view that Herodotus must be followed in placing Solon's laws after 570. This date, however, now receives a remarkable confirmation from its power of explaining the place of the revolution, described by the papyrus, in the constitutional history of Athens. But the very same date explains another difficulty; namely, the interview of Solon with Croesus, declared by Grote to be an anachronism. If Solon had legislated in his archonship in 594, and bound the Athenians to obey his laws for ten years (Hdt. 1, 29), he could not, within ten years, have visited the court of Croesus, who did not ascend the throne till 560. But if Solon legislated after the accession of Amasis in 570, and took a reasonable time to compile his extensive system of laws, he may very well have legislated not long before 560, and, within ten years after his legislation, have paid a visit to Croesus, king of Lydia. Herodotus justifies himself, and must not be condemned out of later chronologists.

I propose, therefore, to arrange the whole history of Solon's legislation in the following chronological order:—

- B.C. 594. Solon archon. The Seisachtheia or remission of debts.
- 586. Damasias (2) archon. Revolution against the Eupatrid monopoly of the archonship, described in the papyrus at Berlin.
- 570. Amasis king of Egypt. Afterwards (Hdt. 2, 177), Solon, made general legislator at Athens, transfers the archonship from the Eupatridae to his first three classes.
- 560. Croesus, king of Lydia. Within ten years of his general legislation, Solon visits Sardis (Hdt. 1, 29).

THOMAS CASE.

ΣΩΦΟΝΗ.

In our salvage from the wreck of Greek literature the word *σωφρόνη* = *σωφροσύνη* is found at one place, Hes. *Theog.* 102 *σω-*

φρονέων, and a certain emendation of W. Dindorf's restores it at one more, Pind. *Ol.* II. 95 *σωφρονῶν*. The MS. variants in the latter

passage, *δυσφρόνων, δυσφροσύναν, δυσφροσύνας, δυσφορᾶν, δυσφορᾶν, δυσφορῶν*, present a lively picture of the dangers encompassing a word so rare as this, and prove that if the Greeks also used *εὐφρόνη = εὐφροσύνη, ἀφρόνη = ἀφροσύνη*, and *σωφρόνη = σωφροσύνη*, it yet need not follow that any trace of the use should now survive in Greek literature. From Greek literature, accordingly, our lexicons cite no such trace: they cite only *εὐφρόνη*—*νῆξ καὶ εὐφροσύνη* from Hesychius, *ἀφρόνη* ἢ *ἀφροσύνη* from Bekker's *Anecdota*, and the proper name *Σωφρόνη* from Arcadius, Aphthonius, Aristaenetus, and the *Etymologicum Magnum*. Yet that the words were really used might be suggested not by *δυσφρόνη* only, but by *καλλονή* beside *καλλοσύνη* and *πημονή* beside *πημοσύνη*, without reckoning the *ἡδοσύνη = ἡδονή* of Hesychius; and I here essay to shew at any rate the existence in Attic tragedy of *σωφρόνη = σωφροσύνη*.

Eur. *Hipp.* 1032-5:

εἰ δ' ἥδε δαιμαίνουσ' ἀπώλεσεν βίον
οὐκ οἶδ' ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐ πέρα θέμης λέγειν.
ἔσωφρόνησεν οὐκ ἔχουσα σωφρονεῖν,
ἡμεῖς δ' ἔχοντες οὐ καλῶς ἐχρώμεθα.

Verse 1034 is interpreted *she was virtuous though she had not virtue*; and this no doubt is the sense required. Phaedra was virtuous in her conduct, acted virtuously *γνώμη νυκῶν τὴν Κύπριν πειρωμένη* and preferring death to shame, although, as the victim of incestuous passion, she had not virtue. When commentators demand this sense they do well, but they do ill when they thrust it on the Greek. No scholar, once challenged, will deliberately maintain that *ἔχω σωφρονεῖν* can mean *ἔχω τὸ σωφρονεῖν I have virtue*. It means *I am able to be virtuous*; and the line *she was virtuous though unable to be so* is a contradiction in terms. The assailant of an accepted text should be prepared for anything, and should therefore be prepared to hear that this is an oxymoron; to which one can only reply, with Cobet on a like occasion, 'τὸ μὲν μῶρον uideo, τὸ δ' ἀξύν non uideo.' No better sense is the next verse, *while I, though able to be virtuous, made no good use of it*: use of what? whence can an αὐτῷ be supplied? Had Euripides written τὸ σωφρονεῖν or σωφροσύνην, all except metre would have been right: what he wrote is surely ἔσωφρόνησεν οὐκ ἔχουσα σωφρόνην: the two words were pronounced alike, so the scribe altered the unknown word to the well-known.

Eur. *Tro.* 1055-7:

ἔλθοῦσα δ' Ἄργος ὥσπερ ἀξία κακὸς
κακῇ θανέται, καὶ γυναιξὶ σωφρονεῖν
πάσαισι θήσεται.

This is the only instance in tragedy of the construction *τίθῃμι τινι ποιῶν τι*: the tragedians say *τινά*. Of the accusative there are nine clear examples: Aesch. *Ag.* 1036 *ἐπεὶ σ' ἔθηκε Ζεὺς ἀμνήτιος δόμοις | κοινωνὸν εἶναι χερνίβων*, ib. 1174 *καὶ τίς σε κακοφρονῶν πίθησι δαίμων...μελίζειν πάθῃ*, Eur. *Hec.* 357 *πρώτα μὲν με τοῦνομα | θανεῖν ἔρᾶν τίθησιν*, *Herac.* 990 *Ἦρα με κάμνειν τίνδ' ἔθηκε τὴν νόσον*, *Med.* 718 *παίδων γόνυς | σπείραι σε θήσω*, *Ion* 75 *Ἴωνα δ' αὐτὸν...ὄνομα κεκλῆσθαι θήσεται καθ' Ἑλλάδα*, *frag.* 63 Dind. *ἀκραγὰ γάρ μ' ἔθηκε θεσπίζειν θεός*, *Rhes.* 918 *ἔρις | τεκνείν μ' ἔθηκε τόνδε δύστηνον γόνον*, *Stob. flor.* 108 23 *τῶν δ' ἀμυχάνων ἔριος | πολλοὺς ἔθηκε τῶν παρόντος ἀμπλακεῖν*. These nine examples leave us in no doubt how to construe a tenth, Eur. *Herc. Fur.* 221 *Θήβαις ἔθηκεν ὅμμ' ἐλεύθερον βλέπειν*; the construction is *ἔθηκεν ὅμμα*, and *βλέπειν* is epexegetic. *Herac.* 163 I leave out of count: *θεῖς* did not come from Euripides, and would not affect the question if it had. A tragic poet then had the choice of two constructions, *τίθῃμι γυναικας σωφρονεῖν* and *τίθῃμι γυναιξὶ σωφροσύνην*: here metre required *γυναιξὶ σωφρόνην | πάσαισι θήσεται*.

Aesch. *Pers.* 829-30:

πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐκείνων σωφρονεῖν κεκηρημένοι
πινύσκει' εὐλόγοισι νουτετήμασιν.

From *σωφρονεῖν κεκηρημένοι* it is no longer attempted to extract sense: the old interpretations suited the context ill, and it was none too clear how the Greek could bear them. The reading now in vogue is *κεκηρημένων*, which is proposed by a late scholiast and rendered *χρεῖαν ἔχοντα σωφρονεῖν*. It is not perhaps inconceivable that *σωφρονεῖν κεκηρημένοι* could mean *κεκηρημένον σωφροσύνης* or *τοῦ σωφρονεῖν*; but I should like an example: why did not Aeschylus write, as has been conjectured, *τοῦ φρονεῖν*? As close as possible to the MS. (for *ν* final is merely a superscript line) and thoroughly satisfactory in sense and construction alike will be *σωφρόνη κεκηρημένοι*, since ye are wise, an equivalent of Homer's *φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχηρητ' ἀγαθῆσιν*. And it is most encouraging to find that this is the conjecture, where proposed and how supported I do not know, of Meineke.

Aesch. *Ag.* 179-83:

στάζει δ' ἐν θ' ἔπνω πρὸ καρδίας
μνησιπήμων πόνος
καὶ παρ' ἀκοίτας ἤλθε σωφρονεῖν.
δαμόνων δὲ τοῦ χάρις
βεβαίως σέλμα σεμνὸν ἡμένον.

στάζει πόνος is a phrase which could here convey to Greek ears no meaning whatever; but it is not easy to say which of the two

words is corrupt. Wecklein's *στηρίζει* ὁ ἔμπω is excellent sense and may be right, though it is plainly too far from the MS. to convince. But my concern is with v. 181. It ought to mean *and wisdom comes to men without their wish*; but it cannot. The infinitive sans article, though it can be the subject of certain verbs, such as *ἔστιν*, *γίνεται* and *ξυμβαίνει*, cannot be the subject of a verb outside this well defined class: *ἦλθε σωφρονεῖν* cannot be said for *ἦλθε τὸ σωφρονεῖν*. Of course MSS. will furnish instances of this solecism, as of any other; but we rightly judge these instances too rare and too easily corrected to break down the rule. Thus in Eur. *Ion* 964 σοὶ δ' ἐς τί δόξης ἦλθεν ἐκβαλεῖν τέκνον it can hardly be doubted that we are to read *δόξ'* *εἰσῆλθεν* with Hermann. Again, corruption is generally recognised in Aesch. *Ag.* 584 αἰὲ γὰρ ἡβᾷ τοῖς γέρονσιν εὖ μαθεῖν. The proposed corrections are various: I myself believe firmly in Mr. Margoliouth's *ἡβη*; but perhaps the further alteration *ἡβη καὶ γέρονσιν* will give a more forcible verse, and will really better explain the error of the MS. Just as in *Suppl.* 79 ἡ καὶ has become *ἡβαι*, so might *ἡβη καὶ* here become *ἡβηβαι*, which the loss of one *ἡβ* would reduce to the *ἡβᾷ* of the codex Florentinus: τοῖς, a natural supplement to the metre, is quite superfluous to the sense, and καὶ seems to point the antithesis: compare too *frag.* 278 Dind. καλὸν δὲ καὶ γέροντα μανθάνειν σοφά. The solecism of v. 181 can be removed with the usual ease by the substitution of *σὺ φρόνα*: how often α is confused with the compendium for εἰ need scarcely be said.

The evidence for *σωφρόνη* would be strengthened if we could discover in the tragic texts any vestige of *ἀφρόνη* or of *εὐφρόνη* = *εὐφροσύνη*. Now it will perhaps surprise the reader to hear that *εὐφρόνη* = *εὐφροσύνη* stares us in the face from all the MSS. and editions of no meaner author than Sophocles. In *El.* 17—19 we read

ὥς ἡμῖν ἦδη λαμπρὸν ἡλίου σέλας
ἔφα κινεῖ φθέγματ' ὀρνίθων σαφῆ,
μέλαινα τ' ἄστρον ἐκλέλοιπεν εὐφρόνη

and we are direly troubled to find a construction for *ἄστρον*. *ἐκλέλοιπεν* does not take a genitive, and, even if it did, that would not help us. Nor, because *χιόνος πτέρωγι* can be rendered in English a *snowy wing*, does it follow that *εὐφρόνη* (*νύξ*) *ἄστρον* can mean *νύξ ἀστερόεσσα*, the *starry night*. To speak of a white wing as a wing of snow, that is, made of snow, is comprehensible and poetical; but night is not made of stars. Wunder in vain seeks to shew that *astrorum nigra nox*

tallies with *λαμπρὸν ἡλίου σέλας*: it would tally with *λαμπρὰ ἡλίου ἡμέρα*, could such a phrase be found; but who will find it? Now all this trouble springs from the presumption that *εὐφρόνη* means *νύξ*. It means *εὐφροσύνη*: *ἄστρον εὐφρόνη* the *festal gathering of the stars* is an expression like the *ἄστρον ὁμήγουρις* of Aesch. *Ag.* 4. The conception of the stars as a choir of revellers was familiar to the ancients: it recurs for instance in Soph. *Ant.* 1147 χορὰ γ' ἄστρον, Eur. *Ion* 1074 Διὸς ἀστερωπὸς ἀνεχόρευεν αἰθήρ, χορεύει δὲ σελάνα, *El.* 467 ἄστρον αἰθήριοι χοροί, and *frag.* 593 Dind. ἄστρον ὄχλος ἐνδελεχῶς ἀμφιχορεύει. Indeed almost a translation of μέλαινα ἄστρον εὐφρόνη is given by Tibullus in II. 1, 88 *lascivo sidera fulua choro*. What is the true derivation of *εὐφρόνη* = *νύξ* I do not know, nor did Sophocles; but what Sophocles, and probably his contemporaries too, supposed to be its derivation, this passage appears to shew.

It is to the misconception which obscured its meaning that *εὐφρόνη* here owes its preservation. Had it not occurred in a context where it seemed susceptible of the meaning *νύξ*, we may be pretty certain that the scribes would have altered it as they altered *δυσφρονᾶν* in Pindar. Accordingly we shall not expect to find it uncorrupted in Aesch. *Cho.* 779—82, if Aeschylus wrote it there, which I admit to be uncertain.

νῦν παραιτούμενα μοι, πάτερ
Ζεῦ θεῶν Ὀλυμπίων,
δὸς τύχας τυχεῖν δέ μου κυρίως
τὰ σωφροσυνεν μαιομένους ἰδεῖν.

The last two verses, which are obviously and perhaps hopelessly corrupt, should, to judge from the antistrophe, be reduced to these metres:

— — — — —
— — — — —

The former verse may reasonably be written *δὸς τύχας εὖ τυχεῖν κυρίως*: *δέ μοι*, which means nothing, seems to be rightly regarded by Bothe as a corruption of *δόμον*, and *δόμον* would be accounted for as an explanatory supplement if *κυρίως* stood in the text: *εὖ τυχεῖν* is plausibly inferred by Hermann from the scholion *εὐτυχίαν εὐτυχῆσαι*. In the next verse Hermann writes *σώφρων* *εὖ*, which is believed to mean 'who desire to see virtue in the ascendancy.' The meaning, if possible, is surely poor, and dearly bought at the cost of assuming that so simple a word as *σώφρονα* would be changed to anything so monstrous as *σωφροσύν*. I see here no place for *σώφρων* or *σωφροσύνη* or *σωφρόνη*, and I propose

the following as obtaining a better sense by more legitimate expedients:

δὸς τύχας εὖ τυχεῖν κυρίους
τοῖς εὐφρόνῳν μαιόμενοις ἰδεῖν

grant that good luck befall my lords who yearn to see joy and gladness. I suppose that just as Pindar's scribes wrote *δυσφροσύνας* in *Ol.* II. 95 so the scribes of Aeschylus here wrote *εὐφροσύνας*; that the likeness of *οι* to *α*, and a wrong division of letters, produced *τὰ σενφροσύνας*, instantly altered to *σωφροσύνας*; and that a subsequent correction *εν* was accidentally substituted, not, as was intended, for *ω*, but for *α*, whence *σωφροσυνεν*. But, as I said, the lines may be past mending.

I have found no further trace of *εὐφρόνη*. The change of *εὐφροσιν* to *εὐφρόνας* in Aesch. *Eum.* 635 would render that passage translatable, but would not remove all its faults; and there is more likelihood about Schuetz's hypothesis of a lost verse, containing a finite verb and a substantive for *εὐφροσιν* to agree with. On *ἀφρόνη* I may add one remark. In

the first volume of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* Mr. Verrall shewed that the tragedians, in their parsimonious employment of words in *-οσύνη*, seldom or never lose sight of certain associations which these immigrants brought with them from Ionia. Now the text of Euripides contains three examples of *ἀφροσύνη* where cause for its use is not readily to be described: *Tro.* 990 τὰ μῶρα γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶν Ἀφροδίτῃ βροτοῖς | καὶ τοῖντομ' ὀρθῶς ἀφροσύνης ἄρχει θεᾶς, *Bacch.* 1302 Ἥενθεϊ δὲ τί μέρος ἀφροσύνης προσῆκ' ἐμῆς; *I.A.* 1431 οὐκ οὖν ἐδῶ σ' ἀφροσύνη τῇ σῇ θανείν. It is quite possible then, I would not go so far as to call it probable, that in these instances the form *ἀφρόνη*, which the metre equally permits, should be restored. I say the metre equally permits it, for Euripides' reluctance to lengthen a short vowel before a mute followed by *ρ* did not prevent him from writing *ἀφρονα* with the first syllable long in *Alc.* 728.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

DER ATTISCHE PROCESS.

Der Attische Process, von M. H. Ed. MEIER u. G. F. SCHÖMANN, neu bearbeitet von J. H. LIPSIVS. Calvary, 1883—1887. Pp. xvi. 1053. 20 mk.

WHEN Professor Lipsius undertook at the request of the late lamented Professor Schömann the re-editing of *Der Attische Process* (published in 1824), two courses were open to him. He might either have reprinted the text as it stood, giving his additions and corrections in an appendix, as Fränkel did with Boeckh's *Staatshaushalt der Athener*, or he might have treated the text with the same freedom that Meier and Schömann themselves would have done if they had brought out a second edition, very much as several scholars are now re-editing K. Fr. Hermann's *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Antiquitäten*. Neither method is free from inconveniences; by the former the reader is constantly called upon to modify the information gained from the text by the light of the notes, by the latter too much of the original work may be sacrificed. Lipsius has to a large extent avoided these inconveniences by combining the two methods; where necessary, he has transposed parts of the text, omitted, made additions (marked by square

brackets), and where it was possible to correct with certainty, altered (such alterations being indicated by stars) and usually given his reasons for so doing in foot-notes; he has likewise removed such traces of dual composition as that on p. 181¹ = p. 216², and on p. 725¹ = p. 943²; in this instance he decides in favour of Meier, who was of opinion that the dicasts were confined to a choice between the estimates of the opposing parties, whilst Schömann held that they had a discretion to award what punishment they pleased. Lipsius' treatment of the text seems to me if anything too conservative, thus on p. 173 as to the question whether the dicasts ever met on the Areiopagus, he has left the text *lässt sich nicht entscheiden*, whilst altering the note; Schömann had refrained from deciding the question, for he says in the note: *wenn es wahr wäre, was D. versichert*, but Lipsius rightly substitutes: *da D. versichert*; see also p. 659 and n. 495.

There was some danger of the value of this new edition being impaired through the decision of the publishers to issue it in parts; but even the first parts published as far back as 1883 are brought up to date by the full *Addenda* and *Corrigenda* (1024—1033). Of course in quoting ahead Lipsius

was obliged to quote the pages of the first edition, but the reader will as a rule be able without difficulty to find these references (the pages of the first edition being given in the margin), except in the case of those portions which have been transposed. Such transpositions occur especially in Book III.; *γραφὴ παρανόμων* (p. 382-286¹ = p. 428-437²) now finds a more appropriate place since it was laid before the Thesmothetae and not before the collegium of Archons, *δίκη ἐπιτροπῆς* (p. 293f.¹ = p. 360²) and *δίκη παρανόας* (p. 296-298¹ = p. 566-568²) are transposed as being both private, not public actions, *δίκη ἀφαιρέσεως* (p. 394-402¹ = p. 657-665²) is transferred to the jurisdiction of the *δικασταὶ κατὰ δῆμους* from that of the Archon, as are likewise from that of the Thesmothetae *δίκη βλάβης* (p. 475-481¹ = p. 650-657²), *ἐξούλης* and *ἀχαριστίας* (p. 485-489¹ = p. 665-670²), and all the *δίκαι πρὸς τινα* (p. 490-550¹ = p. 670-735²) except *μεταλλικαί*, *ἐμπορικαί*, and *ἐρανικαί*. In such a case an index is helpful, but this one (not by Lipsius himself) is by no means as full as it should be, and does not in any way do justice to the large amount of labour of which the book bears such abundant evidence, *e.g.*, under *γραφὴ ἐξαγωγῆς* the reader is referred to p. 445f.; this should be p. 443f., and two more references should have been given, *viz.*, p. 275, n. 209, and p. 791, n. 105—under *εἰσαγγελία* there is no reference to p. 359, n. 445, p. 373, n. 503, p. 387, n. 541, p. 425, etc. It is impossible within the limits of one article even to touch upon all the additions and corrections which the reader meets with on every page of this work, or to enumerate even all the larger sections inserted, such as p. 28-38 on the introduction of the heliastic courts, p. 94 the *εἰσαγωγαί*, p. 111 the *ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν νεωρίων* (*cf.* p. 467f.), p. 571-603 on succession, p. 737f. on *ἀντιδόσεις*, etc. In two appendices Lipsius discusses some obscure passages in the orators. In app. i. he contends, that from Lysias fr. 44, S. the conclusion cannot be drawn that the public arbitrators were introduced under or after the archonship of Eucleides; the law concerning arbitrators there mentioned ordained that all private suits had first to be submitted to these arbitrators before being brought into a court. For each year a certain number (which cannot be ascertained) of citizens, not less than sixty years old, were by lot elected public arbitrators, who under the presidency of prytaneis formed a collegium; they were divided into ten sections, one for each phyle, and for each suit an arbitrator was appointed, again by lot, out

of the section fixed for the phyle to which the accused belonged. In app. ii. Lipsius deals with [Dem.] liii., p. 1251, § 14, and Hyp. *pro Eux.* c. 44. The former passage he explains by the supposition that in a *δίκη εἰς ἐμφανῶν κατάστασιν* (as in a *δίκη ἐξούλης*), if the court had awarded damages to the plaintiff, the defendant was condemned to pay to the treasury a sum equal to those damages. In the latter passage Boeckh explained *ἐντὺς* in *ἐντὺς τῶν μέτρων* to mean both *inside* and *outside*, according as the spectator takes up his position, so that the passage would mean 'to cut outside your own boundaries, but inside the boundaries of those whose property is invaded.' To this Lipsius takes exception; he translates 'inside the part of the mines claimed by the state as its own,' an explanation which is at variance with the generally received opinion that the state owned all the mines.

The best means perhaps of arriving at a just appreciation of Lipsius' industry and judgement as editor will be to select and discuss more in detail a single paragraph, *e.g.*, *docimasia* (p. 200-214¹ = p. 235-247²). Meier gives two kinds of *docimasia*, Lipsius four or rather five; to those of persons appointed to public offices, and of the orators, he adds those of orphans, of newly-admitted citizens, and of the *ἱππεῖς*; and in discussing the first two kinds makes most important additions and alterations. In n. 88 he maintains in opposition to Meier the necessity of *docimasia* for the *ἐπιμεληταὶ τῶν φυλῶν* and *δήμαρχοι* before the *φυλαὶ* and *δῆμοι*, and on p. 639, n. 422, he mentions also the *docimasia* of the *ἐρανισταί*, which is not given in the index. He combats (n. 91) both Meier's view that in this examination conducted by the senators, inquiries were made as to special qualifications in case of certain officials, and K. Fr. Hermann's opinion that the only inquiry was as to citizenship. He shows it to be highly probable that the *docimasia* of the nine Archons alone was conducted both by the senators and a heliastic court, whilst those of all other officials were conducted by a court alone. He turns to account (n. 121) Schömann's explanation of Aesch. i. 111f. as to a second vote in connexion with the *ἐκφυλοφορία*, and refers in n. 122 to his own paper in *Leipz. Stud.* iv. p. 151f., where he shows that the Archons were during their term of office members of the Areopagitic council. He corrects (n. 130) Meier's view that an orator against whom an *ἐπαγγελία* was brought, was thereby prevented from speaking in the assembly. In n. 123 he

suggests that the *γραφὴ ῥητορικὴ* is the same as an *eisangelia* against an orator (the third paragraph of the *νόμος εισαγγελτικός*). It seems almost impossible from our lack of trustworthy information to give a certain definition of this term. Harpocration volunteers two, either it means an action against an orator *γράφαντός τι ἢ εἰπόντος ἢ πράξαντος παράνομον*, and by way of explanation he adds *ὥσπερ λέγεται καὶ πρυτανικὴ ἢ κατὰ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἐπιστατικὴ ἢ κατ' ἐπιστάτου*—or some actions were so called, he says, *ὅτι κατὰ διαφόρους νόμους οἱ κατὰ* (this *κατὰ* was not in the MSS., but was inserted by Petitus, *legg. Attic.* 3, 2, p. 347) *τῶν ῥητόρων γραφαὶ εἰσάγονται*. It is strange that if *γραφὴ ῥητορικὴ* is the same as an *eisangelia* against an orator, the term should never occur in any of the speeches delivered in such a trial, and nothing is gained by Harpocration's explanation, for neither a *γραφὴ πρυτανικὴ* nor a *γραφὴ ἐπιστατικὴ* is otherwise known; when Socrates as *ἐπιστάτης* refused to put the motion to the vote, the speakers threatened *ἐνδεκνύναι καὶ ἀπάγειν* (Plat. *Soer. Apol.* p. 32 B); the prytaneis were frequently charged with venality (Lys. vi. 29; Arist. *Pac.* 905f.), but nowhere is a *γραφὴ πρυτανικὴ* spoken of. Hence I think it more probable that the second definition gives us a right clue, viz., when a *γραφὴ* (in its wider sense 'public trial,' cf. [Dem.] xlv. 9; [Xen.] *de rep. Athen.*, 3, 2) was brought into court by a *ῥήτωρ* acting as *συνήγορος* or *σύνδικος* (μετὰ *ψηφίσματος*, Lex. *Rhet. Cant.*, p. 667, 14), this was done *κατὰ διαφόρους νόμους*, i. e., he was not liable to a fine in case he did not obtain the fifth of the votes (as happened sometimes, see Din. i. 54). But to return to Lipsius' treatment of *docimasia*. Meier and others denied that the *δοκιμασία παίδων* alluded to by Arist. *Vesp.* 578, possessed any legal significance (*de gentilit. Att.* ii. p. ix.); K. Fr. Hermann in a review of this essay points out that under these circumstances the co-operation of a court is unintelligible, and suggests a different explanation (*Staatsalt.* § 99, 16, and § 120, 8), which has, as far as I know, not found acceptance. Lipsius, following Kirchhoff, who first combined the above passage from Aristophanes with (Xen.) *de rep. Athen.*, 3, 4, takes this *docimasia* to have been an examination of

orphans as to puberty, preceding their registration in a *demus*. Schulthess (*Vormundschaft*, p. 34, n. 1) doubts the possibility of deciding the point in this manner, but the ancients evidently thought differently (see Leist, *Graeco-Ital. Rechtsgesch.*, p. 68f. and cf. the meaning of *dreihaarig* in old German law, *Zeitsch. f. d. Altert.* 1886, p. 352). From Ol. 115 every newly admitted citizen was subject to a *docimasia* before a court; this is evident from inscriptions. Fränkel and Hartel place the date earlier referring to [Dem.] lix. p. 1375, § 90f., but Lipsius shows in Bursian's *Jahresber.* xv. p. 310 that the passage does not bear out this view.

It will be seen from the above specimen of Lipsius' treatment of a single question how thoroughly he has done his work; by so carefully bringing together and so judiciously weighing the scattered literature on the subject, and giving us so much from his own store of knowledge, he has placed all students of classical antiquities under deep obligations.

I have noticed only one or two misprints: p. 213, l. 11, *ein* in *ein Timema* should be spaced or with a capital; p. 371, n. 489, Meier *de Andoc. or. c. Alcib.* v. pt. 12 (not vi.); p. 625, n. 379, Pollux vii. (not viii.); p. 639 *πληρωτὴς τοῦ ἐράνου* (not *φόρου*); there is also something wrong with the first sentence of n. 571 on p. 961. In conclusion I may mention a few points where a further reference might be given: p. 259, n. 153 add C. i. A. ii. 578, l. 17 *τὴν εἴθνην* for the form *εἴθνη*; p. 304, n. 306 add Ps. Plut. *vitt. X. oratt.* p. 851 F. for the second meaning of *ἀπογράφειν*; p. 329, the impunity of the prosecutor in an *eisangelia* was abolished long before 330 B.C. the date of the speech, Demosthenes, p. 310, § 250, refers to the time following immediately upon the disaster of Chaeronea; p. 443, n. 715 add Ps. Plut. *vitt. Andoc.* p. 834 E. (and Tzetz. *Hist. Chil.* vi. 373f.), a third instance of *ἐξαγωγή*; and p. 709, n. 648, cf. Thalheim in Hermann's *Griech. Antiqu.* ii. 1, p. 922. The existence of the *auctor secundus* in Attic law (p. 718) in early times at any rate is proved by the inscription published in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.* no. 46, 1887.

HERMAN HAGER.

'Echoes of Hellas.' By PROF. GEORGE C. WARR, with illustrations by WALTER CRANE. London: Marcus Ward & Co., 1887. £4 4s.

THIS beautiful book is a charming memorial of two performances which will be fresh in the memory of many readers; the 'Tale of Troy,' given in London in 1883 and 1886, and the 'Story of Orestes,' given in 1886. The 'Tale of Troy' consists of selections from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, excellently translated into English verse by Prof. Warr, and arranged by him in a succession of scenes, for dramatic representation. It is divided into two parts. Part I. contains four scenes from the *Iliad*. Scene 1 shows the Trojan women praying to Athene at the Scaean gateway; Helen, with Priam, viewing the warfare from the walls; and then the parting of Hector from Andromache. In Scene 2 Priam is going over the moonlit plain of Troy to Achilles, with the ransom for Hector's corpse; the moment chosen is that at which Hermes, having brought the king close to the hero's dwelling, reveals himself ere he departs to Olympus. Scene 3 is the 'Interior of the tent of Achilles,' who yields to Priam's supplication. Scene 4 returns to the Scaean gateway; it is the mourning for Hector, with the laments of Cassandra, Hecuba, and Andromache. Part II. gives us four scenes from the *Odyssey*,—the first two in Phaeacia, the others in Ithaca. Scene 1 is Nausicaa awaking from her dream, and asking her father to lend her the 'smooth-running mule-wain,' that 'she may take the goodly raiment to the river to wash.' Scene 2 presents Ulysses in the palace of Alcinoüs; the minstrel Demodocus is led into the hall, and chants the 'Lay of the Trojan Horse'—a composition which Prof. Warr has founded chiefly on the description in Quintus Smyrnaeus. Scene 3 transports us to Ithaca; Ulysses, still disguised, is brought by Eumæus into the presence of Penelope and Telemachus; Eurycleia washes his feet, and discovers the scar. Scene 4, a brief one, makes a peaceful and sunny close; Penelope is asking Ulysses to forgive her first doubts of his identity.

It will be seen that much skill has been used in meeting the two essential conditions:—(1) that such situations should be chosen from the epic texts as might lend themselves, not merely to dramatic presentation, but more especially to effective *tableaux*; (2) that these situations, while comparatively few in number, should be so related to each other as to exhibit in outline the central interest of each epic. In the case of the *Iliad*, the second condition was somewhat difficult to fulfil. 'The wrath of Achilles' could not easily be portrayed except by its results in the story of Hector. In order to supplement the scenes chosen from the *Iliad*, Prof. Warr has prefixed to them a sonnet, 'Achilles,' having 'the wrath' for its theme. A sonnet on 'The sea-faring of Ulysses,' prefixed to Part II., similarly represents that side of the *Odyssey* which could not be brought within the scenic framework.

'The Story of Orestes' is a series of scenes from the Orestean trilogy of Aeschylus, chosen on the same plan as those from Homer. Act I. is entitled 'Agamemnon,' and comprises three scenes,—the watchman waiting for the beacon; the reception of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra at the palace gate; Clytemnestra standing over the bodies of Agamemnon and Cassandra. Act II. ('The Libation,'—answering to the *Choephoroe*) shows Electra and Orestes at Agamemnon's grave. Act III. ('The Furies') has, for Scene 1, the temple of Athene Polias at Athens, where Orestes implores the protection of the goddess against the Furies; for Scene 2, the Areopagus,—the acquittal of Orestes, and the conciliation of the Furies by Athene. Prof. Warr prefaces

Act I. with two sonnets,—'Até, or the Sacrifice of Iphigeneia,'—and 'Nemesis: the Return of Agamemnon.' Before Act II. he places another sonnet, 'The Dirge at the Tomb of Agamemnon'; and another, 'Orestes before the Areopagus,' precedes Scene 2 of Act III. These sonnets, like those belonging to the 'Tale of Troy,' are happily conceived for the purpose of introducing the several scenes and suggesting the links of thought which connect them.

An epic is perhaps a more favourable subject than a drama for the purpose of representation by excerpts. When the dramatist places before us the great scene between Achilles and Priam, he is doing a thing different in kind from what the poet has done, and is vivifying that portion of the epic narrative in a new way. But when scenes are detached from the texture of a play, each scene inevitably loses something of the effect which, in the dramatist's conception, belonged to it as part of 'a single action.' Prof. Warr has done all perhaps that could be done to surmount this disadvantage; and if, in the result, we prefer the 'Tale of Troy' to the 'Story of Orestes,' it must be allowed that the latter, in the shape given to it here, forms at least a splendid series of impressive pictures.

The volume is illustrated with eighty-two designs by Mr. Walter Crane, which in several cases are free reproductions of the original tableaux. Thus the picture of Aphrodite, Paris, Helen, and Peitho is founded on a group arranged by Sir F. Leighton; the 'Parting of Calypso from Ulysses' was composed by Mr. H. Holiday; and the 'Sacrifice of Iphigeneia' by Mr. G. F. Watts. In some of the architectural backgrounds, again, Mr. Crane has taken suggestions from the scenery designed by Mr. E. J. Poynter, who was associated with Prof. Warr and Sir C. Newton in the first production of the 'Tale of Troy' (1883). The pictures are placed on each page around, above, or below the letterpress to which they relate; an arrangement which has a peculiar fitness, since it serves to keep constantly before the reader's mind the proper significance of the book, as a literary and artistic record of scenic representations. It is beyond our province to estimate the technical qualities of the designs; but every one who enters into the spirit of the poetry must appreciate their great beauty, their genuinely sympathetic interpretation of the Greek texts, and the versatile ability which they show. None of them have given us more pleasure than those which illustrate the *Odyssey*.

A separate volume contains a pianoforte arrangement of the choral music used at the performances—twenty-three numbers in all. The prelude to the 'Tale of Troy' was composed by Mr. Otto Goldschmidt; the music for the *Iliad* by Mr. Walter Parratt; and that for the *Odyssey* by Mr. Malcolm Lawson, with the exception of one piece (the 'Song of the Shuttle'), which was the work of Dr. W. H. Monk. The music for the 'Story of Orestes' was composed wholly by Mr. Walter Parratt. Not a few of those who were present at the performances will be glad to possess this musical supplement.

Finally, mention is due to an Introductory Essay in which Prof. Warr traces the development of Greek thought, in some of its phases, from the Homeric to the earlier Hellenic age; the sketch is popular in style, clear, and suggestive.

It would not be easy, within the limits of a short notice, to convey an adequate idea of the careful labour, both literary and artistic, which has been expended on every page of the work. ἤχον θέσιν ἐχον—to quote Prof. Warr's 'Dedication' in Greek elegiacs—may certainly be said of the poems which these 'Echoes' give back; but the most distinctive charm of the

memorial is one which is scarcely expressed by its title,—the manner in which the voices are blended with the forms of the Hellenic past.

R. C. JEBB.

Sophocles Erklärt von F. W. SCHNEIDEWIN. **Aias, Philoctetes.** Neunte Auflage. Besorgt von AUGUST NAUCK. 1 Mk. 50.

It is now more than thirty years since the task of revising Schneidewin's *Sophocles* for posthumous editions was intrusted to August Nauck. The grounds which led this conscientious editor insensibly to modify without recasting this great work are stated by him with much candour in his preface to the fifth edition, reprinted here. 'Es blieb mit anderen Worten nichts übrig als eine stillschweigende Interpolation der Schneidewinschen Arbeit.' The valuable introductions remain substantially unaltered, and many of the first editor's critical notes are retained with his initials (F W S). But the text is practically Nauck's, and in the commentary, though Schneidewin's fine literary taste is often recognizable, there is no distinction made between the old and the new.

Nauck's principles of Sophoclean criticism are well known. His suspicions of the traditional text appear to multiply and deepen with time. And in this last edition he gives distinguished welcome to F. W. Schmidt's *Kritische Studien*, a work which, as he says, 'der an der Mehrzahl der deutschen Universitäten herrschender antikritischen Richtung einen erfreulichen Gegensatz bildet.' But he points out with considerable force that, if the MS. text is so corrupt as he supposes, the ordinary resources of palaeography can carry emendation only a little way. 'In der klassischen wie in der nachklassischen Zeit hat Sophocles viele Leser gefunden: eben deshalb ist der Text der Dichters während einer Reihe von Jahrhunderten bald unwillkürlich bald willkürlich verändert worden ohne irgend welche Rücksicht auf Buchstabenähnlichkeit.'

Hence he leaves much untouched which he would gladly alter. And this, in my opinion, is both wise and fortunate. For the widest study of Greek literature, 'bis zu der späten,' does not seem to have delivered him from certain scholastic 'idola,' such as tend to substitute logical prose for idiomatic poesy. Is it indeed 'ignorance of the laws of Greek and specially of tragic speech,' or 'unacquaintance with old manuscripts' that makes one so 'conservative' as to prefer γελῶσι σὺ γ' ἔχοντες (*Phil.* 258) to σσηρότες γελῶσι, or the newly found (and certainly preferable) γελῶσιν εὐτοχούντες? Or to prefer μάθη, the harder reading, to the commonplace μάθε of some late MSS.? Or to consider τὰ θ' ὅπλ' ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τὰ πικρὰ (*Phil.* 362) as simply impossible? Or to suppose (*pace Canteri*) that ἔχει (*Phil.* 22) may be used of persevering in the same spot, as sometimes in Homer? (This is of course to hold 'eben das Unmögliche für erlaubt.')

The following changes amongst others in Nauck's *Philoctetes* are subsequent to the publication of his seventh edition, exemplifying his favourite saying, 'dies diem docet.'

182. (Critical note) 'ἐν δόαις vermutet statt ἐν βίῳ Pallis; ich habe πάντων ἑμμορος ἀν καλῶν vorge schlagen, halte jedoch die Heilung der Stelle für unsicher.'

294. (Critical note) 'ἐξῶν τι θραύσαι Fr. W. Schmidt.' Nauck silently withdraws his objection against θραύσαι 'weil es absurd ist dass erst nach dem Eintritt des Frostes Holz spalten soll.'

910. κακὸς γνάμων ἔφην (*Naber*).

1003. ξυμάρψατ' αὐτόν (*M. Schmidt*).

1060. χαίρε σὺν Ἀθῆμον πατῶν (*K. Walter*): suggested by Theocr. v. 61, τὰν σαντοῦ πατῶν ἔχε τὰς δρύας.

1459. (Critical note) προῖπεμψεν (for παρέπεμψεν), Pallis, *Soph. Ant.* 857.

In common with Professor Jebb and others, Nauck has now adopted the orthography, as found on inscriptions, of οἰκτίραντες, μείζαι, and some other words. He is even inclined to read ἀφαιρούσθων.

And as a last high light on *Aj.* 647, he suggests φαίνει τ' ἄφραττα, so improving on Herwerden's φαίνει τ' ἄδρα for φύει τ' ἄδρα, the MS. reading. Why the echo and the iteration should be necessary, or what bearing ἀφραττων φῶς of *Phil.* 297 has on the present passage, are questions the answer to which is here too lightly assumed.

LEWIS CAMPBELL.

Sophocles Antigone. In Scholarius usum edidit J. HOLUB. Vindobonae. C. Konegen. 1888. 60 pf.

THE editor's theory is that the Laurentian *codex* is a copy from an archetype which contained very correctly the words written by the poet, but which was dictated by a learned Greek to a copyist who was not a Greek, and who constantly wrote down words similar in sound to the words heard by him but quite different in sense. That the learned Greek should have thus trusted his non-Hellenic amanuensis, and should not have even revised his work, seems remarkable. But it is still more remarkable that on this theory the archetype of *L* contained many constructions, forms and words which we condemn in our grammars and do not include in our dictionaries. The reader will form his judgment of the value of the editor's work by considering the following conjectures:

106. εἰ...κινήσασα = ἐκίνησας.

112. 'Ἀργείων δέ' = ἤξεν = ἤγαγεν.

149. ἐκ μὲν δὲ πολέμων τῶν νῦν θέσθαι ληγουμένων,

where ἐκθέσθαι is explained to mean *prae se ferre*.

263. ἐπηύκτο μὴ εἶδέναι = se ignorare praedicaverat.

392. ἡ γ' ἔρεκτος...χαρά = voluuptas quam tibi non paravisti, where it is assumed that because ἡδονὴν πράττειν might mean 'to secure a pleasure,' ἡδονὴν βέξιν is capable of the same signification.

514. πῶς δὴτ' ἐκείνῳ δυσσεβῶν τι μᾶ' εὖ χάριν; which will at all events serve as an exercise in translation. The edition, be it remembered, is *in usum scholarum*.

351. εἰ γέλωτ' ἐν σοὶ γ' ἔλω. The expression γέλωτ' ἐν σοὶ γέλωτ' is spoken of as a *falsissimum loquendi genus*, but nothing is given in defence of the phrase αἰρεῖν γέλωτα 'to laugh.'

567. Here *L* has

ἀλλ' ἥδε μὲν σοὶ μὴ λέγ'

which was simply corrected by Brunck into

ἀλλ' ἥδε μέντοι μὴ λέγ'.

According to Holub what the learned Greek read out to his non-Greek amanuensis was

ἀλλ' ἡ γ' ἔμεν σοὶ μὴ λέγ',

and the words mean 'but do not say she is still alive,' 'τ' standing for ἔτι, and ἔμεν for εἶναι.

578.

ἐκδέτας δὲ χρῆ

γυναικας εἶναι τάσδε μὴδ' ἀνεμείνας.

The word ἐκδέτας is explained to mean *alligatas* as opposed to ἀνεμείνας *in libertate*.

790. οὐθ' ἀμερίων ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν ὦν.

Here *ἑανδρος* is accepted without hesitation as a synonym for *ἀνὴρ*, as is *γυνάν* for *γυναῖκα* in 980, *ἄνδρας* = *ἐνθης* for *ἄνδους* in 982, and *ἐπαιζομένων* in 340.

In 952 *ὕμβρος* is read for *ἄλβος*, and is conceived to mean 'the sea'; in 572 *ὁ φίλας* *Ἀΐμων* appears as *ὁ φίλας* *Ἀΐμων*, Antigone being supposed to be apostrophised, and the elision of *i* in the dative being supported by quite irrelevant examples. But these views are sanity itself compared with the following. In a passage of recognised difficulty, 972ff., Holub reads,

*εἶδεν ἀρατὸν ἔλκος
τυφλωθὲν ἐξ ἀγρίας δάμαρτος,
ἀλαδὸν ἀλαστόροισιν ὀμμάτων κύκλοις
ἀραχθὲν ἐγγέων,*

and expounds that *ἀλαδὸν ἐγγέων* is *ἀλώμενον ἐγγέων*, and that *ἔλκος ἀλαδὸν ἐγγέων* means 'a wound divorced from the spear,' that is 'not inflicted by the spear,' just as in Eur. *Tr.* 636 *ἀλάται...εὐπραξίας* means 'is divorced from, bereft of, good hap.'

Many of his emendations, e.g. *ἐπαῖξέ παρὰ ἐπιδέεται* in 361, *ὁ παντόθ' ἦρως* for *ὁ παντογῆρως* in 606, *εἰκε ὁ νόψ* for *ἰκε θυμῷ* in 718, postulate in the copyist of *L* an error of the eye, not of the ear. A very few of his conjectures are not impossible, and in these he has been forestalled, as in *ἔμοι γ' ἄρ'* for *ἐμοὶ γὰρ* in 178, *φουταλίαν* for *Ἰταλίαν* in 1119. The only emendation in the book which is his own and is not worthless is *ἃ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει* in 611, and in that passage it may well be doubted whether the *καὶ τὸ πρὶν ἐπαρκέσει* of *L* calls for correction. Of the rest perhaps the least bad, though certainly wrong, suggestion is in the much disputed passage 466ff., which appears thus in his edition,

*ἀλλ' ἂν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς
μητρὸς θανόντ' ἄθικτον ᾗ ὅχ' ἔμην νέκυν,
κείνοισιν ἂν ἤλαυνον.*

Here of course the prodelision and subsequent elision of *ἔσχε* is hideous, and *εἰ ἔμην ἄθικτον ᾗ ἔσχε* is not the Greek of *ei non sepultum sicuti erat putarem*; but we can only say that we assure our readers the other conjectures are worse. If we believed that the editor had succeeded in restoring the archetype of *L* we should have reason to congratulate ourselves on the misapprehensions of the non-Greek scribe, for he certainly copied down much better verses than were dictated to him by the learned Greek who employed him.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

Euterpe: Being the second book of the Famous History of Herodotus. Englished by B. R., 1584. Edited by ANDREW LANG. London. 1888. 10s.

LOVERS of pretty books and quaint English will be grateful to Mr. Lang for publishing this reprint of the translation of the Second Book of Herodotus by B. R., whoever B. R. may have been. Nothing can be better than the translator's way of telling his author's stories, and he tells them with the more freedom as he has evidently no thought that his rendering will be used as a 'crib.' Readers who wish to see him at his best may turn to his account of the 'cunning theefe' who stole the treasures of Rhampsinitus (p. 111 ff.).

Mr. Lang has prefixed two essays to the translation: *On the Religion of Herodotus*; and *On the Good Faith of Herodotus*. In the first essay, which really includes two different subjects (the religion of Herodotus and the religion of Egypt), Mr. Lang arrives at the conclusion that Herodotus was a theist, who, if he could have had his choice, would have found the religion of the Persians most after his own heart

(pp. xix., xx.). This may be true. Yet it may be urged on the other side that no one could argue from a man's use of the word *providence* to his views on the Athanasian creed. As a historian, Herodotus looked on human nature as a whole, and so he conceived the divine nature in its relation to man as a whole. Monotheistic ideas come to the surface in his work, as they do, for similar reasons, in Aeschylus and Sophocles. But when life is broken up into sections (individual lives or acts) polytheism reappears, and Herodotus was probably as scrupulous in his worship of special deities as the most pious Greek of his time. A moral monotheism and a religious polytheism may very well exist side by side. In the interesting pages on Egyptian religion Mr. Lang defends his view that the worship of animals was at any rate in part a survival of totemism, and that the custom of representing the elemental gods as animals was due to the same cause.

In the second essay Mr. Lang upholds the good faith of Herodotus—chiefly against the attack of Prof. Sayce. He pleads eloquently for an old and dear friend. The subject is of course far too wide to be satisfactorily settled in the few pages which he devotes to it. We have to ask whether Herodotus intended deliberately to mislead his readers about the extent of his travels; whether he derived his information from the sources indicated; whether the motives and causes which he assigns for actions and events are true; whether he does not carry back the thoughts and feelings of his own time to periods lying one two or three generations before it. These questions require more careful consideration than they have yet received. We are told for instance that Herodotus was at Cyrene (Stein, Rawlinson). Herodotus mentions a statue at Cyrene which looked 'out from the temple,' and quotes the 'Cyrenean account' of certain events, but where is the evidence that he was at the city? It is thought that if Herodotus had been at Thebes he would have given some account of the monuments there, yet neither he nor Diodorus gives any account of the Sphinx at Memphis! At the very beginning of his work we have the story of Io as given by Persian scholars. Who were these scholars, and what did they know or care about Io? The account given is wholly different from that current in Greece (Aeschylus); we may reasonably doubt whether it existed anywhere except in the mind of Herodotus. The same is the case with the account of Helen given by the Egyptians, except that here the Egyptian account is grafted on a Greek version of the legend. When Herodotus is recording the miserable end of Miltiades he quotes the 'common Greek' account up to a certain point, from which he follows the Parian account. Why does he not go on with the common Greek account or, better still, give us the Athenian account? Because the Parian version suits with his view of the situation, though he is compelled to admit that he can give no reason for the visit of Miltiades to the temple of Demeter. The 'Good Faith' of Herodotus, then, is no simple question of facts, but involves a careful inquiry into the views which ancient historians took of their duties, of the latitude which they claimed in giving a dramatic and vivid representation of opinions, causes, and events.

EVELYN ABBOTT.

Polybius, the History of the Achaean League.

Edited with Introduction and Notes, by W. W. CAPES, M.A. London: Macmillan. 1888. 6s. 6d.

MR. FREEMAN has frequently reminded English scholars of the existence of Polybius, and it seems

that at length his representations have had the effect of convincing some of them that there really was such a person, and that his history of Rome is worth reading. Partial translations and editions of selections are beginning to appear, and those who are interested in the later Greek historians and do not close their literature at the death of Demosthenes or their history at the battle of Chaeronea may congratulate themselves on these signs. For the acceptance of Polybius as an author to be edited and studied means a great deal more than the thin end of the wedge; if classical scholars can bring themselves to face the Greek of Polybius and write notes on such words as *φαντασία*, *προστασία*, or *ἀντοφθαλμείν*, they cannot consistently refuse to read Diodorus and Appian, Cassius Dio and Herodian; they must recognise the un-Attic but Hellenistic Greek of Zosimus, Procopius and Agathias, as well as of Julian and Libanius; nor can their extended view be bounded even here. The chain, or *είρμός* (to use the word of Evagrius of Epiphania), whose first link was forged by Polybius of Megalopolis, does not really come to an end until the days of Phrantzes and the Thucydidean Critobulus; Polybius stands first in what we may call the series of 'Graeco-Roman historians.'

Mr. Capes has put together the portions of Polybius which bear on the history of the Achaean League, and has provided his selections with notes both historical and philological. His introduction consists of two parts, (1) on 'the author and his work,' (2) on 'the Achaean League.' The second part gives a brief account of the rise and constitution of the federation. There are two problems connected with the origin of the Achaean and Aetolian leagues, which Mr. Capes has not clearly distinguished. One problem is why the Achaean and Aetolian peoples, who had never played a part in history before, suddenly emerged in the third century from their obscurity and assumed a position of first-rate political importance. The other problem is why the political activities, which were suddenly developed in the Achaean and Aetolian highlands, took the form of federal institutions. The two problems are quite distinct: a solution of the one may be possible, while the other remains unsolved. Let us see what Mr. Capes says on this subject:—

'Why the new movement [of federal unions] spread at first in these two countries, far away from the old highways of politics, cannot now be confidently stated. It is possible, as has lately been suggested, that soldiers of fortune, who had issued from these poor mountain regions, came back to their homes enriched by pay and plunder, and spread around them more material well-being and a bolder spirit of self-respect than could be found in the old historic cities, where the hardier virtues had been gradually exhausted in the hotbeds of political excitement. It would be hazardous however to lay much stress on this, but we may say that federal tendencies would encounter least resistance where the interests of town life were least absorbing, and there were fewer traditions of the past to appeal to local jealousies and pride' (p. xxix.).

The suggestion, which Mr. Capes refers to and passes lightly over, was made by Mr. Mahaffy in his recent volume on *Greek Life and Thought* (p. 7). But Mr. Capes completely misrepresents Mr. Mahaffy's conjecture, which is a remarkable example of a good historical hypothesis. It is the first and not the second of the problems which we distinguished above, that Mr. Mahaffy's hypothesis is intended to solve; and Mr. Capes misconceives it as an attempt to solve the second. The return of mercenary soldiers to their mountain homes, enriched by pay and plunder, supplies a plausible explanation for the sudden rise of

the countries which were nurseries of mercenary soldiers; Mr. Mahaffy, as far as I understand his words, never supposed that it supplied any explanation of the 'federal tendencies.'

The first part of the introduction is chiefly occupied with details (after Krebs and Kalker) about the style and language of Polybius, and is well worth reading. The expedients to which the writer resorts for the purpose of avoiding hiatus are given with considerable fulness; but why is nothing said of the rules of hiatus which were adopted by Polybius and the exceptions which he allowed himself? On p. xviii. a misleading statement is made. It is mentioned as one of the differences which distinguish the Greek of Polybius from Attic that '*ἀνὰ* and *σύν* are rarely used'; and on turning to the notes (p. 321) we read that '*ἀνὰ* is one of the prepositions of the older language which, except in compound verbs, is fast disappearing in the style of Polybius; he uses it mainly in the distributive sense, or in a few adverbial phrases like *ἀνὰ μέρος*, *ἀνὰ μέσον*, *ἀνὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον*, but its local sense is very rare with him.' The conclusion one naturally draws from these statements is that *ἀνὰ* was a preposition of ordinary use in Attic, to express local relation as well as distribution, that in Polybius it is less frequent, and that the tendency of late Greek is to allow it to fall into disuse. But the facts are quite different. Any one who has studied the use of the prepositions in Attic Greek will inform Mr. Capes that *ἀνὰ* is of extremely rare occurrence; and that whenever it does occur it does not bear a local sense. For example, in the extant plays of Aristophanes it is never found, except in the lyrical parts which do not conform to prose usage (in *Ranæ* 554, there can be no doubt that the correct reading is *ἀνημαβολισία*, an adjective formed from *ἀν' ἡμιόβολον*, where *ἀνὰ* has its distributive sense). *ἀνὰ λόγον* and *ἀνὰ μέρος* were Attic expressions, but even in a distributive sense *ἀνὰ* is not used freely before Xenophon. On the other hand, any one who has read the later Greek historians will be able to assure Mr. Capes that nothing is commoner than *ἀνὰ* in a local sense. At the first page of Agathias I open I find *ἀνὰ τὸ Βυζάντιον*. Thus what Mr. Capes ought to have called attention to is not that *ἀνὰ* is fast disappearing in Polybius, but that, having tended to disappear in Attic, it begins to reappear in Polybius, who however still uses it sparingly. In Herodotus it is common enough; the Herodotean *ἀνὰ μέσον*, not used in Attic prose, reappears in Polybius.

In his note on *προαίρεσις* (p. 232, 'This favourite term of Aristotle passes on from the ethical sense of 'intention' to that of 'state policy' in Polybius), it is strange that the editor does not observe that Demosthenes constantly uses the word in the same sense as Polybius. In style the notes are not always clear; for example, on p. 300 we read: 'A few miles off was the temple of Bassae, to build which Ictinus, the architect of the Parthenon, was called from Athens, from which the sculptures have been brought to our National Museum.' This note is intended to instruct readers who have never heard of the temple of Bassae; would not such readers infer that the sculptures were brought from Athens to London, and wonder how they came to be in Athens?

On p. 303 Mr. Rutherford's ingenious suggestion as to the origin of *προπηλακίζω* is mentioned—namely, that it is for *προ-πηλακίζω* (*πηλίκος*) to ask a man's age—and Mr. Capes pertinently asks: 'but why the change to *α*? This is a serious objection, but at the same time Mr. Rutherford is certainly right in rejecting the derivation from *πηλός*. I would suggest that the original word was *προπαλακίζω* = *προκαλκίζω* (the *π* by labiation for *g*, and the second *α* a sheva, as in

μαλᾶκός, &c.), corresponding in form and meaning to Latin *proculco* = *pro-calco*, to trample on, insult. Popular etymology would connect *προκαλαίω* with *πηλός*, 'mud,' and hence the first *a* was altered to *η*. The index of Greek words is a useful addition, but does not seem to be complete; e.g. the word *αλπειοτολ*, discussed on p. 230, is not included.

J. B. BURY.

The Origin of the Leicester Codex of the New Testament. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A. (Camb. Univ. Press. 1887. pp. 66. 4to.)

THIS is an interesting contribution to the genealogical study of later cursive mss. of the New Testament. Codex 69, now the property of the Corporation of Leicester, is described by Scrivener (Intro. p. 190) and has been frequently collated: most recently by T. K. Abbott ("A Collation of Four Important Manuscripts of the Gospels," Dublin 1877.)

Prof. Harris shews that the codex is by the same hand as the Caius psalter which belonged to Friar Brinkley of Cambridge, Provincial of the English Minorites at the time of the dissolution. Both the psalter and the Leicester codex passed from Brinkley's possession into that of William Chark, a Puritan divine at Cambridge, whose library also contained the notorious codex Montfortianus, the production of which in answer to Erasmus' challenge led to the insertion, in Erasmus' third edition of his N. T., of the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses. Prof. Harris shews grounds for the supposition that this latter codex was written by Franciscan friars (or "monks" as he strangely calls them pp. 26, 47, &c.) for the purpose of supporting the interpolation; possibly the actual writer was Friar Roy (this, and not Froy, appears to have been his name) the first known possessor of the ms. Prof. Harris examines the writing, catch-words, arrangement, material, &c. of the Leicester codex, with great learning and ingenuity. Specially interesting, if not absolutely conclusive, is the examination of the water-marks. Taken together, the indications converge upon an Italian origin for the ms., and upon a date not fifty years before the invention of printing. This agrees in substance, though there remain questions of detail upon which difference is still possible, with the conclusion of M. Martin, that this and the allied mss. are traceable to a Calabrian origin.

Enough has been said to shew the interest of Prof. Harris' investigation both for the N.T. critic and for the paleographer. His pages are by no means without human interest as well; his personal and academic prepossessions (pp. 27, 31, 34, 38 note, &c. &c.) relieve the dryness of scientific enquiry. And there are curious antiquarian pickings to be gleaned, of which this is not the place to speak. Prof. Harris' book is very favourably reviewed by Dr. Gregory in Schürer's Theol. Literaturzeitung 1887, no. 25.

A. ROBERTSON.

Hermæ Pastor Græce Integrum Ambitu. Primum Edidit ADOLFUS HILGENFELD. Leipzig: Weigel. 1887. (London: Trübner.) 4 Mk.

PROFESSOR HILGENFELD gives us in the *Prolegomena* an account of the Greek editions of Hermas which have appeared since 1856. In that year R. Anger and G. Dindorf published the complete Greek text as far as Sim. IX. 30, 3. They availed themselves for their edition of three MS. leaves containing Mand. XII. 4, 8, to Sim. VIII. 4, 3, and Sim. IX. 15, 1, to IX. 30, 5, which C. Simonides had brought from Mount Athos, as well as of a copy (apograph II.) which he had made of the earlier and the intervening

portions of the book. On the same MS. leaves, but on a different copy (apograph I.), C. Tischendorf based his edition of Hermas 1856. This however, as well as the later editions by A. Hilgenfeld, 1866 and 1881, O. v. Gebhardt and A. Harnack, 1887, F. Funk, 1878—altogether five since Hefele—stopped short at Sim. IX. 30, 3, *et* 32.... In these editions the remaining portion, IX. 30, 3—X. 4, 5, was added from Latin translations. Simonides had already (1859) published the last Sim. in Greek. But having been convicted of a series of systematic forgeries, his last edition to the text of Hermas was at the time universally rejected as spurious: 'Timendus igitur est hic Danaus et dona ferens, sed etiam dona tulit non respuenda,' says Hilgenfeld. He considers that the man to whom we owe so large a part of the Greek text has a right to be heard when he offers to restore the last remaining chapter, and that his proposal should not be so peremptorily dismissed, as was done by Harnack (*Theol. Lit. Zeit.* 1887, No. 7: comp. No. 21). Hilgenfeld admits the last Sim., not however without a certain amount of hesitation, into his edition, and thus furnishes the first '*H. P. Græce integer ambitu*.' The editor gives in the remaining four chapters of the *Prolegg.* an account of the Cod. Lipsiensis vel Clementinus, the two apographs taken by Simonides, the remaining MSS. of Hermas, the Cod. Sinaiticus and the Cod. Amphilochii, the extracts found in ecclesiastical writers, as well as the old Latin and Ethiopic versions of the last Simm. There follows 'a life of Hermas': the work, it is stated on the authority of Simonides, of a Libyan bishop of the sixth century. The text is accompanied by copious notes. The readings found in the different Codd. and apographs are fully quoted, as well as those which have been adopted in the various editions mentioned above. Antiochus Homm. XCIV. and CXXII. are very appropriately quoted in illustration of Sim. IX. 31 *sq.* The lost portion, Sim. IX. 30, 3—X. 4, 5, is given first as restored by Simonides, next as rendered in the *Versio Vulgata Palatina*, and finally in a Greek translation by the editor. Whatever the value may be of the additions which Simonides offered to make to the Greek text of Hermas, there can be no doubt as to the completeness of this its latest edition.

CHARLES MERK.

Ciceros Rede für Cn. Plancius, für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von DR. ERNST KÖPKE: in dritten Auflage neu bearbeitet von DR. G. LANDGRAF. 1 Mk. 20.

THOSE who know Dr. Landgraf's edition of the speech *pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* will not need to be told that any contributions from his own stores to that which Köpke's Planciana had provided have an independent value: and Dr. Holden will do well to consider them in the next edition of his excellent commentary, which is largely based on Köpke's second edition, as far as we can judge without having the latter actually before us.

We will just notice a few of these points, though it is not always easy to tell what is of Köpke and what is of his *διασκευαστής*.

Reserving purely textual matters for the present, we find in § 16 an entirely fresh treatment of the difficult passage which runs thus in Holden—'vel nescio vel non dico vel denique, quod mihi gravissimum esset, si dicerem, sed impune tamen debere dicere: non recte. nam quid adsequeretur, si illa extrema defensione uteretur, populum quod voluisset fecisse, non quod debuisset?' no explanation, however, being given of the construction of 'vel denique . . . recte,' where the sentence is broken-backed.

Landgraf removes this difficulty by pointing with a comma at recte, and reading *num* for *nam* (nunc TE); thus *adsequere* is apodosis to *si dicerem*, which is further defined in 'si . . . uter.' (Cp. for the order of the clauses *pro Cluent.* § 124 'sin autem, quod subscriptum est, quia verum est, ideoque grave debet esse, hoc quaeramus': and for the double condition, with the apodosis in the middle, Ter. *Hee.* 255 'sin east retinendi causa . . . te mi inuriam facere arbitror si metuis.') The sense given is excellent: 'You ask, Laterensis, why the electors preferred Plancius to you? I am not concerned to answer your question: if I took an extreme line and said what I might say without compromising my client's case, viz. that the people made the wrong choice, acted in mere caprice, you would gain nothing by the admission.'

Another point is in § 23: where 'hoc municipii genere,' translated by Holden after Nägelsbach 'in respect of his municipium,' is more satisfactorily explained, 'in the different character, type, of the municipium to which he belonged.' *Genus* means properly 'kind or class of objects' in such a phrase as 'in omni genere, in eo genere': so that we should expect in 'hoc municipiorum genere,' if so it meant here.

In § 83, 'te in ludos . . . sine tensis autem quid potero dicere?' Holden quotes Long, 'the passage is obscure and Wunder admits that he cannot explain it.' Previous commentators seem to have inferred from this and from § 40, and *Q. fr.* ii. 16; *ad fam.* i. 9, v. 9 (which refer to the preceding trial of Vatinius), that Plancius was tried at the end of August, before the ludi Romani (Sept. 4-20); and indeed have assumed that a trial could not take place during the ludi Romani. But Zumpt has disproved the assumption. Landgraf fixes the date at Sept. 5, approximately. Cicero is meeting irony with irony. 'Laterensis says that he was most reluctant to have the case taken during the ludi, because he knew that I should as usual make oratorical capital out of the religious solemnities, as I had done before in defending aediles. I can assure him he has effectually clipped my wings: sine tensis quid potero dicere?' In § 90 *impiorum* is rightly referred to Clodius and his gang, not (as by Holden) to Catiline.

The book is judiciously arranged for school use. Critical notes go to a Critical Appendix: there is a useful list of divergences from C. F. W. Müller's text of 1886. There is a wise economy of citations: and references to Zumpt, Seyffert, etc., which most students have no mind and most teachers no time to verify, are relegated to what is called a *Sachlich-sprachlicher Anhang*. This contains some things which should have gone into the main commentary, which is sometimes defective. In § 20 *habemus hoc nos*, 'this is a peculiarity of ours,' might have been explained; *habere* = *habere* in se. In § 55 *neque tu haec habes neque eis confidis*, the same verb is explained as neither = 'know' (as Holden) nor 'believe,' but = *in causa habere*; 'you have not got any such facts in your favour.' In § 30 it is unnecessary to say that 'we know nothing of a *vetus ius*' allowing of personal violence against actors: *ius* is not technical, but means 'privilege.' In § 31 '*communis sensus*, the general way of thinking: *sensus communis*, feeling of propriety, tact': surely this cannot be maintained: Hor. *Sat.* i. 3, 65 *communis sensu* = 'ordinary tact' (Prof. Palmer): Sen. *Ep. M.* i. 5, 4 *sensus communem, humanitatem et congregationem*, 'the social sense,' the feeling in which all partake (cp. *Planc.* § 34).

Space forbids us to dwell at length on the text: in thirty instances Dr. Landgraf dissents from C. F. W. Müller. He has made ample use of the critical labours of Madvig, Lehmann, Karsten and

others: but his leanings are conservative. He is slow to bracket or expunge; but is content at the same time, in such cases as those of §§ 40, 78, to offer a reading as provisional only. In § 35 '*ego quia . . . conferuntur*' is retained: in § 40 '*tum* (codd. *edd. cet. tu*) *me ignaro . . . iniquos*' is well defended against Wunder, Cobet, Müller and others, though there is evident corruption at '*inscio notes*.' In § 54 '*rogatus*' is plainly wrong: Karsten conj. '*provocatus*.' In § 77 '*praeferam*' (TE) is retained, others reading '*prae me feram*': for this use (generally post-classical) with substant. object. Landgraf compares *Rosc. Am.* § 87, *de rep.* i. § 52. In § 29 O. Müller's emendation '*futtilis*' is preferred to '*fallax*' (Campe), on palaeographic grounds: in § 95 '*arcum* (codd. *arceum*) *facere ex cloaca*' is palmary. Cp. Prof. Nettleship, *Journ. of Phil.* xxix. 21.

W. Y. FAUSSET.

A Companion to School Classics. By JAMES GOW. Macmillan and Co. 1888.

THIS is a remarkable little book which, unless we are much mistaken, will be warmly received by classical teachers, and will be of no small use even to many advanced students and scholars. Dr. Gow describes it as being an attempt 'to give the information which a commentator is, from the nature of his task, compelled to assume even in a young student.' On questions like Textual Criticism, the Theatres, the Public Economy of Greece and Rome, the commentaries and dictionaries (Dr. Gow remarks) present a vast mass of details, 'but not the history or theory by which such details can be correlated'; and this defect he attempts 'partly to supply,' and 'to give from the latest and best authorities a summary of essential facts and rules.'

The first difficulty in carrying out this programme is obviously the selection of the points on which such summaries will be most useful. Probably if teachers were asked to write down a list of subjects which they would like to see so treated, no two would quite coincide in their lists: though we think it likely they would all agree in declaring that many of the points they most desired to include were to be found here. The best test of this is to give the headings of the chapters.

A. Classical Texts.—The Greek and Latin Alphabets, Books and their Publication, History of Classical MSS., Modern Libraries of Classical MSS., Apparatus Criticus, Textual Criticism, Famous Scholars, Dialects and Pronunciation.

B. Greece.—Greek Chronology, Greek Metrology, History of Athenian Government, Population of Attica, Athenian Officials, Athenian Deliberative Assemblies, Athenian Army and Fleet, Legal Procedure, Finance, Sparta, Colonies and Cleruchies.

C. Rome.—Roman Chronology, Metrology, History of Roman Government, Rome under the Kings, the Republic of Rome, (Magistrates, Characteristics of Magistracy, Religious Functionaries, Deliberative Assemblies, Classes of Free People, Government of Italy and Provinces), Imperial Government, Roman Army and Navy, Law, Finance.

D. The Drama, and E. Philosophy.

Perhaps some will demur to the advantage of summarising the tenets of the various schools of philosophy for beginners, though such summaries are frequently wanted and often given in a detached and bald way. But there can be little doubt of the advantage of *B. C. D.* being presented in a convenient and continuous manual form; while the first book on Classical Texts is just what many students have long sighed for. It presents as fully as is possible in the space an account of just those points on which

information is not to be had in any accessible English work of reference; and yet of points which meet the student at every turn in working at classical authors and in reading commentaries. If any reader will recall his school or college days, and the state of mistiness which pervaded his ideas on manuscripts, glosses, scholiasts, the names of famous scholars, and textual criticism generally, he will be able to measure the avidity with which he would have opened a book like Dr. Gow's, professing to summarise for him 'the essential facts and rules' which would have made order amidst his chaos.

Granted however that the points dealt with are the right ones, the much more important question arises, how these professions are realised in the actual handling. We think that here too Dr. Gow is to be congratulated on his success.

First the authorities consulted on the various points are all recent, so that the information is all posted up to date as far as was possible. The author gives a list in the preface of the chief books to which in the various sections he is most indebted; and they are nearly all either newly published, or re-edited, in the last seven years. This will supply an answer to a possible objection that might be raised on a perusal of the table of contents, namely that on many of the subjects in *B*, *C*, and *D*, information is to be got by the English reader in Dictionaries of Antiquities. The answer is that so much of that information is now wholly or partially superseded, that instructed readers, where they cannot check it, have to accept it with misgivings. To take one example: if the article on the Greek Theatre, for instance, in Dr. Smith's dictionary be compared with Dr. Gow's account, the reader will find in the latter an interesting summary of recent discussions on the Stage, where careful archaeological research has thrown doubt on the traditional account given by the former.

But also, and still more important, the style of Dr. Gow's exposition is excellent. Perhaps the part where it is most difficult to present adequate information in a form at once brief and interesting is the first section on Classical Texts. The success with which this is done is chiefly due to two things: to the tact with which he has selected the prominent and essential facts, and the judicious choice of examples and illustrations. Particularly noticeable are these qualities in the chapter (vii.) on Textual Criticism, where a remarkably good collection is made of instances showing how mistakes arise, and how they are emended. For instance, even the dullest reader must find a new interest in text criticism when he comes on the following illustration:—

'In Seneca, Ep. lxxxi. 4, Madvig found the words: *philosophia unde dicta sit, apparet: ipso enim nomine fatetur. Quidam et sapientiam ita quidam finierunt, ut dicerent, &c.* He set the passage straight by reading '*ipso enim nomine fatetur quid amet. Sapientiam ita quidam &c.*'

Again, the two pages of facsimiles of Greek Uncials and Minuscules, Latin Rustic Capitals, Uncials and Minuscules, will give the young student a better idea of what is meant by those often recurring words than any amount of description, and will tempt him to turn over the Palaeographical Society's publications which have hitherto been undisturbed by him in his school library.

We have only noticed two misprints in the book, one on p. 121, the trivial mistake of *σάβολον* for *σύβολον*; and the other the curious (though hardly misleading) confusion of left and right (in speaking of the Greek writing), which occurs three times on pp. 4, 9, and 10.

We will conclude with two suggestions; first that

there should be rather more illustrations, *e.g.* of the ancient armour, ships, &c. in chapters xvi. xxvii. and xxviii.; of ancient houses and dress, which the author has omitted to speak of; and perhaps facsimiles of ancient inscriptions, like those of early manuscripts, to replace the rather confusing table of letters on page 16. And secondly that those who wish to pursue any point in more detail should be guided by a careful list of works of reference, which need not take up much room, and might be prefixed to each chapter, somewhat in the style most usefully adopted for indicating his authorities in Green's *History of the English People*.
A. S. W.

Griechische Geschichte. Von ERNST CURTIUS. Zweiter Band. Bis zum Ende des peloponnesischen Kriegs. Sechste verbesserte Auflage. Berlin, 1888. 10 Mk.

As compared with the edition from which the English translation is made, the present volume contains alterations and additions which, if not so important as those made in vol. i, are at all events of considerable interest. In the first chapter we have additional matter dealing with the importance to Athens of the foundation of Piræus (p. 18), the building of the first Athenian fleet under Themistocles (pp. 30-33), the first use of ostracism to settle a quarrel between citizens where no idea of tyranny was involved (p. 35), and the effect of the Persian war in reviving interest in the Homeric poems (p. 50). An insertion on p. 124 is calculated to cause confusion. The expulsion of Pausanias from Byzantium by Cimon (Plut. *Cim.* 6, Thuc. i. 131) is placed in the forefront of Cimon's exploits, even before the capture of Eion and freeing of the Thracian coasts. It is obvious from Thucydides that Pausanias did not seize Byzantium until 470 or 469, and Professor Curtius again relates the capture by Cimon in its proper place on p. 131. The renewed strength of Argos (after her defeat in 496) is dwelt upon with more emphasis (p. 142); she is now for the first time the capital city of a large district. On p. 160-1 the substitution of the *νομοφύλακες* for the *Areopagus* as guardians of the laws, and the establishment of the *μητρώον* as the new state record-office, are points on which new light is thrown; close upon which (p. 163) comes a new discussion of the question of the removal of the treasure from Delos to Athens, but the date is not more definitely given than 'some time between 460 and 454.' The position of Boeotian affairs before the battle of Tanagra (p. 169) has undergone considerable alteration. The statement that 'the Peloponnesians had busily strengthened the Theban, *i.e.* the oligarchical party in the whole of the country,' is replaced by the view that it was no longer the old oligarchical party of the Persian wars which was in power, but a new party of democratic inclinations, hostile to Athens, and anxious to make Thebes head of Boeotia. Thus this new democratic party leaned towards Sparta for help, while the remains of the old oligarchic party looked towards Athens. The victory of Oenophyta is thus regarded (p. 170) as resulting not in 'the establishment of democratical constitutions with the help of Attic partisans,' but in the isolation of Thebes, and 'instead of the Boeotian towns uniting against Athens and Thebes, in their entering into an alliance with Athens against Thebes.' This view naturally results in alterations in the description of the movements which preceded Coronea (p. 178). On p. 180 recent inscriptional discoveries affecting the position of Chalcis in Euboea are worked in. The changes in the judicial system under Pericles are entirely rewritten (pp. 217-220). It is now pointed out how the Heliæa could be regarded as the

representative of the whole citizen body, and as such could swear to treaties. Here, and in his description how the *δικαστήρια* gradually took the place of the weakened Areopagus, the author's views have no doubt been influenced by Fränkel. The question of the number of *δικασταί* is discussed, and as a result we are relieved from the picture of the 'fourth part of the entire civic body distributing themselves into their various courts.' The author now quite gives up (p. 223) the idea that it was Pericles, or even a contemporary backed by Pericles, who introduced payment for attendance at the *ἐκκλησία*. He now pronounces that it was certainly an innovation, not truly democratical, of a later date, but the actual time of the change is confessedly unknown. He has also given up the idea (p. 227) that there was in Periclean or even pre-Euclidean times such an official as *ἐπιμελητής* or *ταμίης* of the public revenues, holding office for four years. The relation of the island states to Athens under Pericles is largely expanded (pp. 241-244), in view of new inscriptional evidence; particular reference is made to the grouping of the states for taxation purposes, though the author does not seem to mention how curiously Thucydides' notice of the Athenian allies in II. 9, confirms this view. Particulars of the amount of tribute paid by individual states, the storing and management of the same, the *μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἰσθμίων* given to Athens, are described on p. 247f. To this succeeds (p. 255f.) a vastly improved historical account of the origin and development of the *κληρουχία*, much of which is drawn from recently discovered inscriptions, and (p. 262) some new paragraphs about the *μέτοικοι*. A much fuller account is now given (p. 310f.) of the origin and progress of the fine arts at Athens, of the influence of the islands of the Archipelago, of architectural Athens in general, and of the recognition and influence of Athenian art in the Peloponnese. The estimate of the character of Pericles (pp. 418-423) is largely added to, his panhellenic policy is regarded as his weakest point. More information is given (pp. 482-3) on the relations of Cleon and Aristophanes; the raising of the tribute, probably on the motion of Cleon, and the imposition of the first *εἰσφορά* are new points, and so is the mention (p. 498f.) of the pamphlet on the Athenian Constitution, written in 424, expressing confidence in the position of Athens and her allies, just before the expedition of Brasidas to Thrace showed how precarious that position really was. Passing on to events succeeding the peace of Nicias we find Athenian designs on Epidaurus and the events leading up to Mantinea much more clearly put than heretofore (pp. 596-600). Succeeding this is a useful addition (pp. 606-609) in a description of affairs in *τὰ ἐπὶ Θράκης* after 421. No change is made in the author's earlier views on the Hermocopidae (pp. 633-645). He still seems to regard the event as the result of a combination of men of all political parties, with the object of ruining Alcibiades. He still regards Pisander and Charicles, the leading members of the committee of *ζητηταί*, as disguised enemies of the constitution, 'directly or indirectly responsible for the mutilation itself.' It seems strange that the author has not been able to adopt the views of Gilbert (*Beiträge*, pp. 250-260), who places the whole matter in a far more probable light. Scarcely any alteration is made in the account of the Decelean war. Professor Curtius still maintains (with Herbert and Gilbert) his view of the innocence of the generals at Arginusae, in opposition to Grote's refusal to believe anything evil of a democracy. A useful map of the tribute-paying allies and the *κληρουχία* of Athens, divided into their proper sectional groups, concludes the volume.

A. H. COOKE.

Histoire de la Littérature Grecque. Par A. CROISSET et M. CROISSET. Tome I. Homère; La Poésie Cyclique; Hésiode. Par M. CROISSET. Paris: Thorin, 1887. 8 frs.

THIS is the first volume of what promises to be an excellent history of Greek literature. It contains ample evidence of acquaintance with modern work on the Homeric question, it shows a fresh and independent appreciation of the original Greek, and it is written with the grace and lucidity which we are accustomed to look for in French work. Add to this that the work is eminently sober and you will have a fair idea of the good points of the volume. The author is, as regards Homer, a Separatist. But, let me hasten to add, he is a very reasonable Separatist. He does not believe that the *Iliad* for instance is made up of a number of rhapsodies composed independently of each other by poets working in ignorance of each other's productions. He does not believe that the elements out of which the poem is composed were put together once for all on one definite occasion. On the other hand he does not believe that the original poet of genius left a sketch of the future poem for his successors to fill in. Nor do we hear from M. Croiset of diaskenasta or revisers. If he cannot believe in the very simple theory that the *Iliad* is the work of one author, neither can he believe that it is a fortuitous concurrence of lays or the mechanical production of a commission. His creed is that of organic growth. The way in which he pictures this organic growth is somewhat as follows: we have first to imagine that the tale of Troy was fixed in its main outlines as a matter of tradition or legend before poets began to embroider on it. The *Iliad* itself presupposes that the tale of Troy is known to the listener, and we have a still more pertinent example afforded in *Odyssey* VIII. of the circumstances in which epic poems grew up. In this book of the *Odyssey*, Demodocus when bidden to sing chooses as his theme an incident in the Trojan war, a quarrel between Achilles and Ulysses. Subsequently, the disguised Ulysses suggests that Demodocus should take as his theme another incident in which Ulysses figured, that of the wooden horse, and thus we have an example of the way in which a bard was naturally and necessarily led to embroider on two subjects which, though not connected, still as being drawn from the same tale might come to be connected. In the next place, a careful examination of the *Iliad* shows that different parts are of different ages, that the oldest are the fewest, and that they bear the marks of a common origin. Further, the parts thus shown to have a common origin do not form a continuous poem (this is an instance of M. Croiset's sobriety—he could just as easily have obtained a residuum which did form a continuous poem), though they are connected by the order which they observe and by the fact that they are developments of one and the same situation (this situation I should say is the Quarrel of Book I.; the other primitive parts which develop it are the Exploits of Agamemnon, Book X., the Patroclia, Book XVI., and the death of Hector, Book XXII.). These rhapsodies were evidently composed to be sung singly; at the same time the author when he composed the first, the Quarrel, had the rest vaguely in his mind; and with a very few lines introduced for the purpose these lays, though originally designed for separate recitation, could be strung together so as to make a tolerable whole. This rudimentary epic, however, does not constitute the whole of the inheritance bequeathed by the first great poet to his successors. He seems also to have composed certain

other lays, which have to do with the Trojan war, such as the Exploits of Diomed, Book V., the Farewell of Hector and Andromache, Book VI., the Embassy, Book IX., and perhaps some others. These lays are distinguished from the first set by the fact that their places in the story are not marked so clearly by the necessities of the dramatic development of the tale. It is now plain what there was left for succeeding poets to do: they might and did develop situations only hinted at in the first set of original lays; they had to pin down the second floating set of original lays to a fixed place, and then they had to insert other lays in order to make the whole run easily and continuously. The poets who thus expanded the original series of connected though not continuous lays were, like the great poet who composed the original lays, of Chios, and they were a *genos*. These Homeridae were not the only authors of epic poems, but they had the great advantage over other epic bards that they were a *genos* and that they worked continuously from generation to generation on the same poems, adding and unifying, and so they produced the epics which have outlived all others. The Homeridae were the authors of the Homeric poems.

It is not necessary to remind English readers that Dr. Monro has put the right value on the literary performances of the Homeridae and that there is no sufficient evidence for ascribing to them anything like the importance in shaping the Homeric poems that M. Croiset would credit them with. The Homeridae and diaskenasts are phantoms that ought not now to be pressed into the service of any theory of the origin of the Homeric poems. They do but little real service to the expansionist theory. If the expansionists could prove that the demand for a long epic originated in comparatively late times, their opponents would probably be ready to admit that the demand was supplied somehow, even if the exact means by which or the precise persons by whom it was satisfied could not be ascertained. Wolff thought that by demonstrating the non-existence of a reading public in early Greece he had proved that there could have been no demand for a poem of the length of our *Iliad* or *Odyssey* in the age to which the Homeric poems were commonly ascribed. Professor Paley has shown, and the service he has thereby rendered to the 'higher criticism' of Homer cannot be over-estimated, that a reading public did not exist in Greece before B.C. 420. But both Wolff and Professor Paley have proved too much for the objects which they had respectively in view. Wolff's argument would prove that there was no demand for lengthy epics, and consequently that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* did not exist until B.C. 420. Professor Paley's argument shows that if our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* existed before B.C. 420 (and most people believe they did), they must have been composed for a non-reading public. It is therefore the business of expansionists and aggregationists to show that in the period, the long period, during which the only means of publication was oral delivery, the conditions determining the occasions on which a poet could recite his poem changed in such a manner that in the earliest times he had not an opportunity of delivering a poem of the length of our *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, while later the conditions were such as made the recitation of a long poem both possible and advisable. As a matter of fact however the course of things did not follow this but precisely the opposite direction. With the growth of society the occasions on which an audience could be got together changed in such a way that the poems recited had to be shortened not lengthened, and in this fact lies the solution of the Homeric

question. It is, if not absurd to imagine, at any rate highly improbable that the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* was ever at any period recited right through at a single sitting. We have to suppose that it was begun at one sitting and continued at another, and finished at a third or fourth. Now the larger the audience, the greater the difficulty there is in getting it together on several occasions. The smaller the audience, the more easily it can be collected to hear on one day the continuation of the story it heard commenced the day before. Such an easily collected audience might be found in the village communities which were the largest social aggregates known in the times commonly called Homeric, while in the town life which succeeded village life it was only on stated feast-days that the community could be got together, and then not for a length of time admitting of the recitation of the whole of the *Odyssey* or *Iliad*. If any proof of this were needed it would be found in the fact that the poetry which sprang up, during the period of town life and after the time of the village community, was lyric poetry, which shows by its form that the conditions under which a poet addressed his audience were such as did not admit of long poems. The good king Alcinoüs and the princes of the Phaeacians would have found it slow work sitting drinking their wine night after night had it not been for Demodocus, and doubtless the longer he could make a tale last out, the more nights he could keep one story going, the better they were pleased. But these conditions did not occur after the patriarchal stage of Greek society. Under oligarchy and democracy, life, town-life, was not so leisurely. The pace was forced, and a short lyric, or twice or thrice a year a drama, was as much as the Greek of those days had time for. The fate of the Homeric poems therefore was precisely the reverse of that imagined for them by the expansionists and aggregationists. As time went on the cry was not for longer but for shorter poems, and the response was partly the production of lyric poetry and partly the cutting down of epics by the rhapsodists. Hence the discrepancies which the separatists make so much of. The rhapsodists wished to pick out for recitation two or three books which would of themselves make a tolerably complete story, and if the connection could be helped by the interpolation of a line or two to make the selection hang together they would not hesitate to put in the requisite verses. A line or two also to introduce and to conclude the selection would be necessary, and of course if these or the connecting lines just mentioned became incorporated into the text of the whole poem the result would be the confusion and inconsistencies of which we have an instance in N. 656-659, where Pylæmenes, who had been killed in E. 575-579, is brought in as chief mourner at his son's funeral by a rhapsodist who was reciting a single rhapsody and thought the appearance of Pylæmenes would make an effective climax.

I find it somewhat difficult to make out what M. Croiset conceives to have been the motive the Homeridae had in expanding and unifying the lays which the first great poet composed. On the one hand when he is attacking the theory of original unity, he is very definite in maintaining that the only way to understand a poet's producing such an enormous work as the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* would be to imagine grand, continuous recitations analogous to those which were held subsequently at the Panathenaea at Athens, and it is of course out of the question to imagine any such public recitations in the times called Homeric. On the other hand M. Croiset is inclined to think that the period of organic growth was over, and that the poems were complete,

as we have them, about B.C. 850. But as the Panathenaea did not exist in B.C. 850, and as no other festival, as far as we know, was in existence at that time at which the *Iliad* could be recited as a whole, I do not see how from M. Croiset's point of view the Homeridae in B.C. 950—850 should have had more inducement or opportunity to produce a lengthy epic than their great founder had before that period.

In conclusion, readers of this volume will look with interest for the next and following volumes.

The introduction and the chapters on the Art of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey* are written so freshly and with such evident appreciation of the subject that one wishes to hear what the authors have to say of other departments of Greek literature, where their powers of literary criticism will not be so unfortunately cramped as here they are by the constraint imposed by the expansionist theory.

F. B. JEVONS.

[Our readers will be glad to have the Ode composed for the Bologna Centenary, which we print by the kind permission of the author. We regret that our space does not allow us to give also the excellent translation into Italian verse by Prof. G. Pelliccioni.]

ΤΩ ΕΝ ΒΟΝΩΝΙΑ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΩ

ΕΚΑΤΟΝΤΑΕΤΗΡΙΔΟΣ ΟΓΔΩΗΣ ΕΟΡΤΗΝ ΑΓΟΝΤΙ.

- Māter ἀρχαία σοφίας, ὅθεν Εὐρώπα πάλαι
τῶς ὀρθοβούλου φῶς Θέμιτος νέον ὦρτο,
ἐργμάτων ἱαμα βιασιωτάτων, στυγνῶν ἐλατήριον ἀτῶν,
Εὐνομίας ἀγανὸς κάρυξ βροτοῖς,
5 χεῖματος ὡς δνοφεροῦ
ὅτε φοινικάνθεμον
ἦρ πεδάμειψαν γαίαι,
φαιδίμας χαῖρ' Ἰταλίας ὄνυγατερ, τὰν ἀστέων
πρέσβιστον ἐξ ἄλλων ἐφίλασεν Ἀθήνα,
20 παῖς θ' ὁ Λαοιδας, ὃ τ' ἐλευθερίᾳ χαίρων πολιάοχος Ἑρμῆς
νῦν σε μάλ' ἀδυνάτοις δαιδαλλέμεν
καίριον εἰλογίαις,
ὅθ' εὐρῆς γενέαι
παντοσέμενον χάρματος.
15 ὦραι γὰρ ἐπερχόμεναι θνατοῖς Διὸς
εἰς ἑκατοντάδας ὀκτῶ δὴ τελείας ἐτέων
δόξαν εὐστέφανον Βονωνίας
μαρτυρέοντι γεγάκειν
τῇ καὶ ἀγαλλόμεναι ξείνων πολυγαθέες ἴλαι
20 παντοδαπῶν ἀπὸ πεμφθεῖσαι πολίων ποτινίσσονθ' ἐστίαν
φιλόταταν Πιερίδεσσι, τεῶν
κοινῇ κλείξοισαι χάριν.
φαντὶ Τυρσανοὺς μὲν ἀρηϊφίλους κτίσσαι βάθροις
ἐν τοῖσδε Φελσίναν, ὅθι χεῖμα Σαβάνας
25 γείτονος Ῥήνῳ πεδῖον βρέχει Ἀπεννινύθεν εὐρυνμέτωπον,
πίονα δῶρα τρέφον Δαμάτερος
οὐδ' ἀπαδὸν Βρομίῳ
ὅσα δ' ἔστ' Αἰνειαδῶν
ἐν λόγοις, σιγᾷ σῶμαι
30 Μοῖσα, τὴν δ' ἀρχὰ γλυκερῶν ὑποκείσθω φθεγμάτων,
τῆλοῦ τις ὡς στυλῶν ἀριδείκετος ἀστήρ,
οὐκ ἄμεινον γενεαῖς ἅμα πολλαῖσιν κλέος Ἰρνερίω¹
λαμπάδα κείνος ἀνέσχ' ὀρθὴν Δίκας,
σπέρματα βαῖα πυρὸς
35 ἀνεγείραις κείμενα
δαρὸν ἐν ψυχρᾷ σποδῶ

¹ Imerius (circ. A.D. 1080—1118), 'merito appellatus lucerna iuris, tanquam primus illuminator
No. XVIII. VOL. II.

nostre scientie' (Diplovataccius ap. Sarti P. II. 263).

- τεθμῶν ὅς ἀνοίξει θεοδμάτων ὁδοὺς
τοὺς ὁ μεγιστόπολις Ῥώμας ποτὲ θῆκεν ἀναξ¹ ἐπ. β'.
ἀλλὰ τὸτ' ἀξυνέτοις ἐρμηνέων
40 κάρτ' ἐχάτιζον ἐν ἀστοίς
ἦν τε νέφος βαρὺ δὴ λάθας, πρὶν ἐκείνος ἀναστὰς
εὐθύπορον στίβον ἐξαγήσιος ἀγεμόνευσ' ἀψενδέος,
παντὶ ἔργῳ κανόνας προφέρων
στάθμα παλαιᾷ συμμέτρους,
45 τῶν τε πρὶν ῥήτρας ἀνέδειξε νόμων. οὐδ' ὄρφαναῖς
καρποῖο βουλαῖς ἄπτετο· τοῦ γὰρ ὅπισθεν στρ. γ'.
ἄλλος ἐξ ἄλλου διαδεξάμενοι, ξανθῶς φλογὶ δαδὸς ὁμοῖον,
τόνδε θεμίσκοπον ἀθληταὶ πύονον,
ἄνδρας αἰδοδίκας
50 προδιάσκοντες σοφῶς
ἄγον εἰς εὐκοσμίαν
χρῆ δὲ παύρους γαρύεν ἐν πολέσι· ζεύξον λύρα
τὸν χρυσέαις γλώσσας χαρίτεσσι κλεινόν² ἀντ. γ'.
μηδ' αἰοιδᾶν ἄμμορος ἔστω ὁ θησανρὸς θεμίτων βαθυμήτα
55 πᾶρ προτέροισι κλύων,³ δισσοῖς⁴ ἄμᾶ
τοῖσιν ἐπωνυμίαν
θέσαν αἰδ' ἔδραι πυλᾶν
τᾶν Ῥαβενναίων ἀπο·
πολλῶν δέ με καιρὸς ἐρέκει χάτερων
60 μνάμονα, τῶν ἀπ' αὐτῶν δρεψόμενος πραπίδων ἐπ. γ'.
νίσετο πανταχόθεν πλειστόμβροτος
ἐς πολυκοῖνον ὄμιλος
ὀμφαλὸν Αἰσονίας· ξυνὰν μὲν ὅπ' ἦλθον ἰέντες⁵
ὅσσοι Ἰαπυγίας τ' ἐντὸς πυμάτας πεδίων θ' ἰδρυνθ' ἵνα
65 πλασίαν Ἀλπεσι γᾶν ὕδασιν
ἄρδει ταχυρρώστοις Πάδος·
ἦλθε δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀλλοθρῶν ἀναρίθμητ' ἔθνεα,⁶ στρ. δ'.
οἱ Γαλλίας ναῖον πλάκας, ἦδὲ Τάγοιο
πᾶρ μελαμφύλλοιο βροαῖσι, πολὺπλαγκτός θ' ἵνα κίδναται Ἰστρος,
70 οἷς τ' ὀρέων καθύπερθ' Ἐρκυνίων
εἰς ἅλα Σαρματικᾶν
τέτατο στάθμ', οἳ τ' ἔχον
νάσος Ἀγγλων ἐσχάτας,
πόντιος τᾶν Ὀρσοτρίαινα φύλαξ οὐ λάθεται· ἀντ. δ'.
75 τὰς δὴ ποτ' ἔλθων τοῖδε γόνος πολιοῖθρου,⁷
καλλίπυργος τοῦ φάτιν οἶδε λόγοις Ὀξωνία ἐν πολιοῖσι,
θεσμοφόροιο μερίμνας εὐσκοπον
σπεῖρε διδασκαλίαν·
ἕτερον δ' οὐκ ἄλλοθεν
80 ἄνδρα τεθμοὺς εἰδότα⁸

¹ Iustinianus.² Bulgarus, 'os aureum.'³ Martinus Gosia, 'copia legum.'⁴ Jacobus de porta Ravennate; Hugo de porta Ravennate: quo cognomine significatur ea Bononiæ regio in qua habitabant, cum quattuor priscæ urbis regiones a portis quattuor maiōribus nomina inuenerint (porta Ravennana, porta Procolo, porta Pieri, porta Stieri).—De his quattuor doctoribus, qui sæculo post natum Christum duodecimo medio Bononiæ florebant, post alios dixit Savigny, Gesch. des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter, IV. 66 sqq.⁵ 'Citrмонтани' Universitatis Bononiensis discipuli, olim in Nationes septemdecim divisi.⁶ 'Ultramontani,' ab omnibus fere Europæ partibus Bononiam confluentes, quorum Nationes censebantur duodeviginti.⁷ Vacarius, qui cum Angliam circ. A.D. 1140 venisset iurisprudentiæ studia Oxoniæ instituit.⁸ Franciscum Accursii, doctorem Bononiensem, clarissimi glossatoris filium, in Angliam vocavit rex Edvardus I., qui a Palaestina rediens A.D. 1273 Bononiam devertit. Regis 'secretarius,' 'familiaris,' 'clericus' appellabatur Franciscus, qui decennium in Anglia commoratus cum multa ac gravissima negotia prudenter gessisset, in patriam reversus docendi munus Bononiæ denuo suscepit.

- δουρίκλυτος εὔρετο ποιμᾶν Ἀγγλίας,
 εἴθ' ἀλιερκία πρὸς πάτραν Συρίαθεν ἰὼν
 πᾶρ σέ, Βονωνία, ἴκετ', εἰδέ τε
 μυριοπληθέος ἦβας
 85 φύλα τόπων ἀπὸ πάντων σαῖς παρεόντ' ἐν ἀγυαῖς,
 ἀσυννόμοιο Δίκας σπεύδοντ' αἶειν' σοφίας δ' ἐξαιρέτου
 φιλτάταν Ἦσυχία δύνασιν
 θάμβαινεν αἰχματᾶν ἀγός.
 οὐδὲ μάν, τὸν Φιλυρίδας ποτὲ θρέψ' ἐν Παλίον
 90 βάσσαισι Χείρων, νωδυνίας γ' ἔνεκ' ἐσλῶν
 τεκτόνων γυιαρκέος ἀστὲι τῷδ' Ἀσκληπιῶς ἔσχε τι μομφάν,
 ἀμφὶ τομαῖς¹ κλέος ἄλλοις μὲν πορῶν,
 αὐτόματον δ' ἐτέρῳ²
 συνέμεν νείρων φύσιν,
 95 τὰν θεοὶ κρίψαν πάρος
 ἐντὶ δ' οἷς Μαΐας τόκος ὤπασε, Κυλλάνας σκοπός,
 ξεινᾶν τε γλωσσᾶν κλαΐδας,³ ἥδὲ σοφιστᾶν
 τῶν πάλαι γνώμας φράσαι ὀψιγόνους⁴ τοῦ⁴ δ' ἔξοχος ἦν τότε φάμα,
 ὅς μετ' Ἀριστοτέλει ἵχνη βεβῶς,
 100 ἀντία δ' ἐξενέπων
 Ἄραβος κλεινοῦ φραδαῖς,
 τάνδ' ἐκύδανε πόντιν
 ἴστω δὲ καὶ ἄλλον ἔχοισ' ἐξ ἀρσένων
 οὐκέτ' ἀραρότα κόμπων⁵ δείξε γὰρ ἡ Κρονίδα
 105 παρθένος ἐνθάδε πλείστον παρθένους
 οὐ πινυτᾶς φθονέουσα
 φροντίδος⁶ οὐδ' ἄρα κούρας⁵ πάντ' ὄνυμ' ἐξαπόλωλε
 πατρὸθεν ἀμφιπόλου τεθμῶν, μελετήμασι⁶ πατρώοις ζυγέιν
 ἄλλα τ' ἄλλαις μέλεν⁷ ἦν δέ τις⁷ ἄν
 110 φωνᾶς κελεύθους Ἑλλάδος
 ἐξελίσσοισαν γλεφάροις ἰδε Παλλὰς μελίχοις.
 τίς πάντα κ' ὦν φθέγγεσθαι⁸ ὅσα τοῖσδε πολίταις
 ἔργα λείυσσαι ἡμερόντα βαθύζωνοι Χάριτες παρέδωκαν,
 ἢ Παρίοιο λίθον σμυλεύματα,
 115 κόσμον ὑποῖα τάφον
 ὁ μελαμπέπων λάχεν
 ἱρέων ἀρχαγέτας,⁸
 ἥε ναοὺς πλινθυφένων τε μελάβρων παστάδας
 ἐν Σειρίου θάλπει μαλερῷ σκιοέσσας,
 120 ποικιλᾶν ἢ θανάματα πολλὰ γραφᾶν; θεῖος δ' ἄρ' ὅτ' ἀνδράσιν ἔλθῃ,
 τοῖσδε τὰ καὶ τὰ καλῶν ἄμφαν⁹ Ἔρως
 οἷον ἐφαμερίων
 ἀρετᾶς συμπράκτορα
 φᾶ τις ἔμμεν καρδίαις

¹ Mondino ('Mundinus'), qui circ. A.D. 1315 Bononiae docebat, humani corporis anatomiam in primis illustravit; unde schola medicinae Bononiensis, iampridem inclyta, magis etiam celebrari coeperat.

² Ludovico Galvani.

³ Mirae saltem loquendi facultatis causa commemoretur Josephus Mezzofanti.

⁴ Pietro Pomponazzi ('Pomponatius'), qui postquam A.D. 1512 Bononiam venerat ibi librum 'De Immortalitate Animae' scripsit; vir inter philosophiae studiosos qui post renatam, ut aiunt, litterarum scientiam exstiterant idcirco memorabilis, quod Aristotelis de anima doctrinam ad normam Alexandri Aphrodisiensis potissime interpretans princeps ausus est Averrois ('Araβος') rationem impugnare.

⁵ Novella d' Andrea, A.D. 1312 nata; cui pater Johannes Andreae, iuris canonici doctor nobilissimus, praelectiones habendas interdum delegabat. Velo ab auditoribus discreta virgo docuisse traditur.

⁶ 'Novella in Decretales.' Id nomen libro suo posuit Johannes Andreae, ut Novellae et coniugis et filiae memoria cum novitatis significatione coniungeretur.

⁷ Clotilda Tambroni (A.D. 1758-1817), Josephi Tambroni poetae et historici soror, litterarum Graecarum disciplinae in Universitate Bononiensi prae-fuit.

⁸ S. Dominicus, in aede Bononiensi sepultus.

- 125 ταύτας ποτ' αὐδὸς¹ ἂν' εἶδρας εὐκλείης· ἐπ. ζ'.
 τὸν καὶ ἐοῦ πατέρος τιμᾷ προσέμιξε σέβων
 κείνος² ὃς οἰχομένων ψυχαῖς ἰδεν
 κεκρμέναν τρίχα μοῖραν
 δαιμονίῳ γὰρ ὅσσοις κάλλεος ἔμπετεν οἶστρος,
 130 τῶν χθαμαλῶν λελάθονθ'· ὥς χά φρασὶν Οὐρανίωνων ἀμβολὰς
 συλλαβεῖν μαιομένα βροτέαν
 φόρμυγ' ἀπέρριψεν χαμαί.³
 καὶ πεδ' ἄλλον σοῖσι, Βονωνία, ἀστοῖς Ἰταλῶν στρ. ζ'.
 ἦν καὶ τόδ' εὐχος, χαλκοκρότοισι μινέοντας
 135 ἐν μάχαις κτίσσεσθαι Ἑλευθερίας κρητῖδ' ἀδαμαντοπέδιλον,
 ἀστραβὲς ὄλβον ἔρεισμι' Οἰνωτρίᾳ,
 ὥς ἀπάλακε θεὸς
 τὸν ὑπὲρ κρατὸς λίθον
 Τανταλείου πήματος,⁴
 140 δῶκέ θ' ὄρμᾶν ἄλλοδαποῦ καταπαῦσαι δεσπότην,
 σᾶμ' ἀμβροσάντας περ' ἀμαξοφόρητον.⁵ ἀντ. ζ'.
 βᾶθι δῆ, Μοῖσαισι φίλα, μεγάλων ταῖσδ' ἐν κορυφαῖσιν ἐπαίνων
 παισὶ γὰρ ὥς παρὰ κεννοῖς ἀφθιτος
 οὐ καταφυλλοροεῖ
 145 τοκέων μνάμα, φρενῶν
 ἄνθος αἰδοῖστανον,
 τοιόνδε τὴν εὐσεβὲς ἄγκειται γέρας
 ματροπόλει παρ' ἀποίκων οἷα Καληδόνιον ἐπ. ζ'.
 καὶ τόδ' ὑπεῖρ ἅλα πέμπεται μέλος,
 150 οἰκοθεν οἰκαδ' ἔπουνον,⁶
 τηλεπόροι' ἀπὸ Κλώτας⁷ Ἰταλὸν ἐς πρυτανεῖον
 φαντὶ δὲ καὶ Βορέαν ἰοστεφάνων ἀπ' Ἀθανᾶν ἀρπάσαι
 τὰν Ἑρεχθίδα, καλλιρόου
 παίζουσαν Ἰλίσσου πέλας.

RICARDUS C. JEBB,

Litterarum Graecarum in Universitate Glasguensi Professor.

¹ Guido Guinicelli, poeta Bononiensis (circ. A.D. 1260), quem appellat.

² Dante, Purg. xxvi. 97, 'il padre | Mio, e degli altri miei miglior, che mai | Rime d' amore usâr dolci e leggiadre.'

³ S. Caecilia, qualem ostendit Raphaelis Urbinate tabula in Artium Academia Bononiensi servata.

⁴ Cum Fredericus I. (Barbarossa) a foederatis Italiae septentrionalis civitatibus A.D. 1176 devictus est.

⁵ 'Carroccio,' malus celsus in plastro vectus,

taeniis duabus albis a vertice defluentibus insignis et Christi in cruce pendentis effigiem medius ferens, quo tanquam signo militari in proeliis utebantur Itali.

⁶ Ad exemplar Universitatis Bononiensis a Nicolao V., Pontifice Summo, A.D. 1450 constituta est Universitas Glasguensis, quam instituta ann. 1482 condita vigere praedicant 'per accepta privilegia matris nostre Studii Bononiensis, omnium universitatum liberrime.'

⁷ Clyde flumen.

NOTES.

Βουλυτός, 'the hour when the ox is unyoked,' is explained by Liddell and Scott to mean *evening*. But an examination of the passages adduced by L. and S. shows that Βουλυτός must mean *the time immediately after noon*. Thus—

Iliad Π. 777 sqq.

ὄφρα μὲν ἥελιος μέσον οὐρανὸν ἀμφιβεβήκει,
 τόφρα μάλ' ἀμφοτέρων βέλε' ἤπτετο, πίπτε δὲ
 λαός·

ἥμος δ' ἥελιος μετενίσσεται βουλυτόνδε,
 καὶ τότε δὴ κ.τ.λ.

Here the hour of noon is marked by the expression 'when the sun bestrode the mid-heaven'; and the beginning of the afternoon by the phrase 'but when he began to cross over to βουλυτός.'

Again *Odyssey* I. 56 sqq.

ὄφρα μὲν ἥως ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
 τόφρα δ' ἀλεξόμενοι μένομεν πλεονὰς περ ἑόντας·
 ἥμος δ' ἥελιος μετενίσσεται βουλυτόνδε
 καὶ τότε δὴ κ.τ.λ.

Here the morning and forenoon ('the sacred day was growing') are sharply distinguished from the passage of the sun across the meridian to βουλυτός. Eustathius on this passage defines βουλυτός as 'either noon or a little after it,' ἡ μεσημβρία ἐστὶν ἡ ὀλίγον τι μετὰ μεσημβρίαν ὅτε βόες λύνονται τοῦ κάμνειν.

The passages of Homer are not quite conclusive, for it might be said that in them βουλυτόνδε indicates not the next, but the last point, in the sun's passage from the meridian, i.e. sunset rather than the early

afternoon. However a familiar passage in Aristophanes (*Birds* 1498 *sqq.*) is quite decisive. Prometheus, coming on the stage under shelter of an umbrella, lest Zeus should see his traitorous correspondence with the enemies of the gods, asks anxiously what o'clock it is.

ΠΡ. πρὶν' ἐστὶν ἄρα τῆς ἡμέρας;
ΠΕ. ὀπρὶν' αἱ; σμικρὸν τι μετὰ μεσημβρίαν.
ἀλλὰ σὺ τίς εἶ; ΠΡ. βουλευτὴς, ἡ περαιτέρω;

Here as the fun consists in Prometheus' anxiety to know the *exact* time of day to a minute, we may be certain that βουλευτὴς means the earliest time after midday which had a designation at all. It must have followed very closely after noon, since Prometheus supposes that the hour may be later (περαιτέρω) than βουλευτὴς, and still be only a little after noon (σμικρὸν τι μετὰ μεσημβρίαν). Thus Eustathius' definition of βουλευτὴς is correct; it was either noon or shortly after noon.

Horace supports this interpretation of βουλευτὴς by describing the time when oxen are unyoked as the hour when the shadows of the mountains are changing:

sol ubi montium
Mutaret umbras et juga demeret
Bobus fatigatis. (Carm. iii. 6, 41 *sqq.*)

For before noon the shadows fall westward, after noon they fall eastward, and the time when the change of shadows takes place is just at or after noon. This therefore is the hour of βουλευτὴς.

Elsewhere than in Greece it has been the custom to stop the day's ploughing at noon. In ancient Wales (Seebohm's *English Village Community*, p. 124 *sq.*) "it would seem that a day's ploughing ended at midday, because in the legal description of a complete ox it is required to plough only to midday. The Gallic word for the acre or strip, 'journal,' in the Latin of the monks 'jurnal' and sometimes 'diurnal,' also points to a day's ploughing; while the German word 'morgen' for the same strips in the German open fields still more clearly points to a day's work which ended, like the Welsh 'cyfar' at noon." It is doubtless a mark of primitive husbandry when the ploughing stops for the day at noon. At a more advanced stage of agriculture, the ploughing is resumed after the midday rest. In Aberdeenshire, I am told, the horses are unyoked from the plough about noon; after a rest they are yoked again and plough till toward evening. Hence in Aberdeenshire the morning and afternoon ploughing is each called a 'yoking.' Cf. *jugum*, *jugurum*. In this case there are two βουλευτοί, one at midday and one at evening; and writers of a later age, familiar with the custom of ploughing till evening, might use βουλευτὴς vaguely in the sense of evening, as appears to have been done by Aratus (825 *sqq.*), with the Schol. βουλύσιος δὲ ὄρνη τὴν δύσιν κεκλήκε and a poet in the Anthology (ἀστὴρ βουλευτοῖο, cited by L. and S.). But the use of βουλευτὴς to mark one definite hour of the day could hardly have originated at a time when there were two separate βουλευτοί in a day. Hence from the fact that in Greece down to the time of Aristophanes at least, and (judging from the statement of Eustathius) probably much later, the term βουλευτὴς was so used to designate one particular hour of the day (namely the time immediately after midday), we may infer that in early Greece, as in Wales and Germany, ploughing regularly stopped for the day at noon.

J. G. FRAZER.

COINS ATTACHED TO THE FACE.—IN the June number of the *Classical Review*, Mr. W. R. Paton explained Pindar's ἀργυραῖοι πρόσωπα ἀοδαί, no

doubt correctly, by the modern Greek custom of a musician sticking on his face the silver coins which he receives as payment. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the ancients attached silver coins by means of wax to statues from which they believed they had derived benefit (Lucian, *Philopseudes*, 20). This custom has also survived in modern times, for in Rhodes Sir Charles Newton saw people sticking gold coins with wax on the faces of saints (*Travels and Discoveries in the Levant*, I., p. 187), and in a church in Lesbos he saw a gold coin stuck on the face of the Panagia, and was told that it was a native offering for recovery from sickness (*id.* II., p. 4). In the distant island of Celebes when a young man is pleased with a girl at a spinning festival, he sticks a silver coin on her brow so that it adheres; if it is not returned to him, his suit is accepted (B. F. Matthes, *Einige Eigentümlichkeiten in den Feden und Gewohnheiten der Makassaren und Buginesen*, p. 4, tiré du vol. II. des Travaux de la 6^e session du Congrès international des Orientalistes à Leide).

J. G. FRAZER.

* *

THESE conjectures seem to me probable:

(1) Aesch. *P. V.* 859.

ὅφ' ὦν σὺ λαμπρῶς κοῦδὲν αἰνικτηρίως
προσπηγούσης ἡ Διὸς κλεινὴ δάμαρ
μέλλουσ' ἔσσεσθαι τῶνδε προσαί, εἰς, τι

From τῶνδε I have given the reading of M as represented by Wecklein who uses an asterisk to mark erasures.

I feel sure that μέλλουσ' ἔσσεσθαι is sound and that ἡ should be replaced by δ (an independent conjecture of my own though previously made by Futsche). But the real corruption lies in the last words, the source of the difficulty being, as the MS. shows, some obliteration in an earlier MS. by which the letter coming after προσ was illegible. The Aeschylean words I take to have been ΤΟΙΑΠΡΟCΜΕΝΕΙCΕΤΙ but the A was so nearly obliterated as to be read as Δ and the M irre recognizable. Τῶνδε was a natural correction of ΤΟΙΑ when σ' ἔτι was misread σε τι. The words bear an appropriate meaning. 'Such high estate still awaits thee.'

(2) *Id.* 969.

σέβου προσεύχου, θῶπτε τὸν κρατοῦντ' ἀέ,
ἔμω δ' ἔλασσον Ζηνὸς ἡ μὴδὲν μέλει.

The sense is improved if σὺ μὲν is read in place of σέβου, the pronoun having given place to a marginal gloss on θῶπτε.

(3) Thuc. II. 76. ἄς βρόχους τε περιβάλλοντες ἀνέκλων οἱ Πλαταιῆς κ.τ.λ. Since it is impossible to conceive of the beam of a battering-ram being snapped in this way, I believe that ἀνέκλων arose from faulty transliteration of the Thucydidean ΑΝΕΙΑΚΟΝ combined with transposition of the Κ and Λ.

W. GUNION RUTHERFORD.

* *

SOPHOCLES, *Antigone* 782-790. Ἔρωσ, δε ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις . . . ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμνηεν.—In a note on this passage, published in the *Classical Review* for July (p. 224), Mr. J. B. Bury says:—"It seems to me an unfortunate idea to introduce into this line the notion of 'desire of riches.' Commentators have

gone wrong,' he proceeds, through not seeing that *ἐν κτήμασι πίπτεις* means 'falkest upon the spoil' (like a warrior after victory). As my edition of the play had appeared some months before the note above mentioned, I should like to observe that I, at least, am not one of the commentators who have introduced 'the notion of "desire of riches."' The drift of my interpretation, 'Love, who maketh havoc of wealth,' is, on the contrary, that Love makes men *reckless* of riches, as of everything else. It is doubtless a mere coincidence that the version of *ἐννευχέεις* which the writer cites, 'keepest vigil' (he prefers, 'keepest sentry'), is the same as mine; for, had my version been before him, my commentary, on the same page, would also have been under his eye. The version 'spoil,' for *κτῆμασι*, which Bellermann gives ('er stürzt sich auf seine Beute'), is a modification of Schneidewin's, 'Love falls upon his slaves.' The objection to the latter seems to be the use of *κτῆμα*, as I have remarked in my Appendix (p. 255): and a similar objection applies to the version, 'spoil.' 'Spoil' here could mean only the *persons* whom Love subdues. We should require, then, a word capable of implying 'captives,'—an idea which *κτῆμασι* alone certainly would not suggest.

With regard to *ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμνην*, the following remarks may be offered. (1) *ἔχων* cannot be dismissed by saying that 'Love is conceived not as a disease but as a warrior.' It is characteristic of Sophoclean imagery (especially in lyrics) that it is sometimes mingled with literal expressions, as I have had occasion to notice on *Ant.* 117 ff., *O.T.* 866, 1300. Further, if *ἔχων* is rejected on this ground, *μέμνην* must go also; since a rigid maintenance of the military metaphor would require *καταδεδούλωται* or the like. The objection to the conjecture *ἐκὼν* is (to my apprehension) that it introduces an anticlimax. With *ἔχων*, the context is,—'none can escape thee, and he to whom thou hast come is mad; the just themselves are ruined by thee.' With *ἐκὼν*,—'none can escape thee (and, indeed, some people do not wish to escape thee); the just themselves are ruined by thee.' Such a parenthesis would be true, but tame.

R. C. JEBB.

* *

AN EMENDATION IN Euripides.

Iphig. in Aul. 722-724.

ΚΑΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ.

ἡμεῖς δὲ θοῖνῃν ποῦ γυναιξὶ θήσομεν;

ΑΤΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ.

ἐνθάδε παρ' εὐπρύμοισιν Ἀργείων πλάταις.

ΚΑΥΤΑΙΜΝΗΣΤΡΑ.

καλῶς ἀναγκαίως τε· συνενέγκοι δ' ὁμῶς.

καλῶς in the third line must be wrong and has been altered to *κακῶς*. *ἀναγκαίως* on the other hand is an excellent word, but neither is it what Euripides wrote in my opinion. Clytaimnestra being told that her daughter's marriage-feast was to take place beside the ships exclaims indignantly:

καλῶς ἀν' ἀγκύρας τε; συνενέγκοι δ' ὁμῶς.

'What? among the *hawesers* and *anchors*? however be it so, and may good come of it.'—Of course *καλῶς ἐν ἀγκύραις τε* is equally probable.

ARTHUR PALMER.

* *

In *Classical Review*, July, 1888, p. 227, Mr. Page quotes the phrase *Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος* as a distinctly Roman phrase occurring in Luke, and therefore of importance as bearing on his connection with Rome.

The phrase is one of a class very common in Greek inscriptions of Asia Minor, and justifies no such inference as Mr. Page draws. *ὁ καὶ* is commonly rendered by the Latin *qui et*: but the Latin phrase is not an early one, and in place of being the original of the Greek, as Mr. Page assumes, is really only a translation. The fact that it is declined on the analogy of *τοῦ καὶ*, *τῷ καὶ*, shows the influence of its Greek original, which was translated even at the expense of grammar. Many of the cases in which *qui et* is used are names of Greeks, and therefore only confirm my assertion that the Greek form is the original. Moreover, *qui et Asiaticus* has not the ring of a true Latin relative-pronominal usage.

W. M. RAMSAY.

* *

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE ΔΙΔΑΧΗ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων.

The text of the *Διδαχή* is a good one and presents few difficulties. It has some clerical errors which are readily removed, but no light has been thrown by conjectural emendation upon any of its less transparent passages, as I have ventured to remark elsewhere in writing upon it. These passages have now been for the most part explained as they stand sufficiently to remove doubts as to the accuracy of the text. One or two expressions, as *ἰδρωτάτω* and *ἐκπετάσεως*, still need some further discussion or illustration, to which the following notes may serve as a slight contribution.

Chapter I.

For *ἰδρωτάτω* in the saying, *ἰδρωτάτω ἢ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου μέχρις ἂν γνῶς τινὶ δῶς*,¹ it has been proposed (1) to read *ἰδρωσάτω* from the known form *ἰδρῶς*, and (2), retaining *ἰδρωτάτω* as a present imperative from a *λαρὰς* *legomenon* *ἰδρωτῶ*, to prefix to it the negative *μὴ* as a correction of the sense. Neither emendation is necessary or appropriate.

For (1), while there is no grammatical objection to the form *ἰδρωτάτω*, a present imperative suits the context and an aorist *ἰδρωσάτω* does not, since the context implies a continuing process: 'Let thine alms go on-sweating into thine hands until thou know to whom thou shouldst give,' whatever 'sweat' may mean. Winer gives examples of the present and aorist imperative in the same verses of the New Testament, as *ἀπαρε...καὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε κ. τ. λ.*, 'Take these things at once hence, and make not as a practice my Father's house a house of merchandise.'

And (2) the negative is not required, for there is no such contradiction as has been assumed between this saying and the preceding, 'give to everyone that asketh,' but the one is addressed to a class of persons to whom the other is not applicable. When it is said that a man is to give freely *ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων* it implied that he has the means. But what if he has to sweat (Gen. iii. 19) for his living and has nothing to spare? Then let his alms sweat into his hands, 'let him labour (*κοπιάτω*) that he may have to give to him that needeth' (Eph. iv. 28). It is not contemplated that such a person will be asked to give or lend, but when he has accumulated a little by dribblets he must think well how he shall bestow it,

οὐ γὰρ τὸν ἐμὸν ἰδρῶτα καὶ φειδωλίαν
οὐδὲν πρὸς ἑπὸς οὕτως ἀνοήτως ἐκβαλῶ
πρὶν ἂν ἐκπύθωμαι πᾶν τὸ πρᾶγμ' ὅπως ἔχει.

It is possible that the *Διδαχή* is referred to in Q. 88 of the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem*, καὶ ἄλλος

¹ The *iota subscript* is not written in the manuscript.

πάλιν ὁ μισθὸς τοῦ γεωπόνου ἐξ ἰδίου ἰδρώτος ποιούντος συμπάθειαν, καὶ ἕτερος ὁ τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ ἀπὸ δώρων καὶ προσδῶν παρέχοντος (Migne xxviii. 651).

Professor Skeat has called my attention to the following passage of *Piers Plowman* (B. vii. 73), in connexion with the two sayings of the *Διδαχή*, *Give to every one that asketh* and *Let thine alms sweat into thine hands* :—

‘ Catoun kenneth men thus, and the clerke of the stories,

Cui des videto, is Catounes techinge ;

And in the stories he techeth to bistowe thyn almes ;

Sit elemosina tua in manu tua, donec studes cui des.

Ac Gregori was a gode man, and bade vs gyuen alle That asketh, for his love that vs alle leneth.’

The saying, *Sit elemosina tua &c.*, looks like a corruption and perversion of, *Sudet elemosina tua in manus tuas, donec scias cui des.*

Chapter IV.

‘ My child, thou shalt remember night and day him that speaketh to thee the word of the Lord, and shalt honour him as the Lord... And thou shalt seek out day by day the faces of the saints *ἵνα ἐπαναπαῇς τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.*’

1. In illustration of the form *ἐπαναπαῇς* compare in the *Shepherd of Hermas* :

Vis. i. 3, 3, μετὰ τὸ παῖναι αὐτῆς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα λέγει μοι κ. τ. λ.

Vis. iii. 2, 1, ὁμοίς δὲ οὐ θέλετε παῖναι ἀπὸ τῆς πονηρίας ὑμῶν.

Sim. ix. 5, 2, μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀναχωρῆσαι πάντας καὶ ἀναπαῇναι λέγω τῷ ποιμένι κ. τ. λ.

2. The *Διδαχή* was divided into chapters by its editor Bryennius, not always quite rightly. The beginning of his eleventh chapter clearly belongs to the preceding ; and chapter iii should perhaps extend to the words *ἵνα ἐπαναπαῇς τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.* It would thus comprise the whole series of sayings beginning severally with *τέκνον μου*, and relating to the Commandments of the Decalogue in the order, 6, 7 and 2, 8, 9, 5 (Matt. xix. 19), an arrangement which I have endeavoured to explain elsewhere. The sayings which follow, as being of a different character, and not addressed to the ‘child’ in the faith, would then stand very appropriately at the beginning of a chapter.

Chapter X.

1. πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὅτι δυνατὸς εἰ σὺ ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

The editions read... ὅτι δυνατὸς εἰ σὺ ὁ ἢ δόξα κ. τ. λ., but it is simpler to read σὺ ὁ ἢ δόξα κ. τ. λ., since σὺ ὁ is nearer in letters and sound to σὺ.

Chapter XVI.

The σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως has been explained to mean a spreading out (as of bright clouds) so as to form a cross.

Irenaeus writes to the effect, ‘Rursus autem passionem Domini typum esse dicentes *extensionis* Christi superioris,’ of which the Greek must have been ἐκπετάσεως κ. τ. λ. (*Adv. H.* IV. 35, 3. Cf. IV. I and VII. 2). Whatever be the precise meaning of this, it supplies an analogue to the absolute use of ἐκπετάσεως in the *Διδαχή*. Notice in Job xxxvi. 26 the alternative versions, ἐὰν συνῇ ἐπέκτασις νεφέλης, and ἐκπετάσμου κ. τ. λ., comparing xxvi. 9, ἐκπετάζων ἐπ’ αὐτὸν νέφος αὐτοῦ. The use of ἐπέκτασις to denote cruciform extension may have been very early, the Gnostics whom Irenaeus quotes being perhaps responsible only for their peculiar application of it to the upper world ; and so too may have been the use of ἐκπέτασις in the *Διδαχή*.

C. TAYLOR.

LACTANTIUS AND ORIENTIUS. — Teuffel in his *History of Roman Literature*, ed. 1882, remarks (§ 464-8) that the *Commonitorium* of Orientius ‘scheint sich besonders an Lactant. Inst. anzuschliessen.’ I am not minutely acquainted with Lactantius, but I venture to doubt Teuffel’s statement. One expects, of course, a good deal of difference to exist between 300 and 400 A.D. ; for instance, it would be unreasonable to expect much about monks from Lactantius (*Or. Comm.*, ii. 336). But the dissimilarities between the two writers seem to go beyond this. For instance, Orientius advocates celibacy (i. 390-440), Lactantius regards it as the exception, possible only to a very few (vi. 23). Orientius describes the future life and the end of the world in general language that is common to many writers (ii. 270, 350) ; Lactantius works out details from the Apocalypse (vii. 14-26). Generally, the vices and virtues dwelt on by the one are slightly touched by the other, and in the minor points of style and diction I have found no real resemblance. Even the biblical quotations are different throughout. I have ventured to raise this question because Mr. Ellis in his preface says nothing about the sources of Orientius.

May I (as I hope) correct another detail in Teuffel l.c. ? The line *non ignarus enim*, &c. (i. 405) has no reference to the troubles brought on Gaul by the Vandals in 406 A.D. As the context shows, it means ‘I was a man of like passions with yourself.’

F. HAVERFIELD.

* *

A CORRECTION.

SIR,—In my notice of Mr. Roberts’s work, which was published in the last number of the *Classical Review*, without my having seen the proof sheets, I am made responsible for the monstrous word *ἀσφυμαλῖαν* (p. 195). As I cannot expect that many readers would take the trouble to correct it from my paper (*Jour. Hell. Stud.* 1881, p. 223), may I be allowed to explain that the point which I wished to bring out was that (according to the interpretation of the symbol which is accepted by all recent German writers on Greek dialects) we have ρ preceded by digamma at the beginning of a word, whereas, on the interpretation followed in the work I was reviewing, we have ψρ at the beginning of a word : the former is a possibility, the latter an impossibility. But, as I do not know what the word is which begins with *Fρ*, and as I wished to put my meaning in the briefest terms possible, I inserted in my table the first eleven symbols of the line where the word occurs, and in my text used the expression ‘actual or possible Greek words,’ intending the reader to gather from this that my interpretation had the advantage over the other of giving a possible beginning of a Greek word. At first I wrote the word beginning at *F*, but as I wished not to give even the appearance of proposing a word *Φρμαλῖαν*, I inserted the two preceding letters, and intended the reader to gather from the want of a breathing over α that I did not quote a single word. The printer however, unable to endure Greek symbols without breathing or accent, defeated my purpose by inserting both.

The fact that the review was written partly in Athens and partly in Smyrna, and that I had not with me my own copy of the book, with notes of the points which I intended to touch on, must be also my excuse for an inaccuracy in the note on p. 195, ‘too late to be of use for Mr. Roberts’s work.’ The article in question is noticed at length in his *addenda nova*, p. 377. This inaccuracy does not affect the point

which I wished to make: that Mr. Roberts sometimes admits restorations and theories from German epigraphists without sufficiently sharp criticism, and that no. 24 (p. 60) is an example.

Had I seen the proofs I should by one or two

slight changes of expression have marked more clearly my intention in criticising the book, and my general impression that its faults were easily corrected, while its usefulness was certain to be great.

W. M. RAMSAY.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

Das Ionische Capitell. Siebenundvierzigstes Programm zum Winckelmannsfeste der archäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin, von OTTO PUCHSTEIN. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer. 3 Mk.

THE influence of Winckelmann upon the archaeological studies of the present age is underrated by those who judge of the man by his writings alone. Learned and appreciative as his books are, they need, it is true, rarely be consulted to-day either by the specialist or by the general reader. But as one of the earliest and greatest furtherers of practical research Winckelmann will always remain, as Puchstein calls him in the present essay, 'our *ἡσας καὶ κτίστης*.'

Winckelmann's cherished design, the excavation of the Olympian altis, has been accomplished by his countrymen after a delay of more than a century, and its results bear the proudest testimony to his insight and suggestiveness. His influence in directing attention to the material remains of antiquity is of far greater importance than his attainments as a chamber scholar. First among the great archaeologists of Germany to remove the sphere of his life and labours from the dusty libraries of the north to classic lands, he is justly celebrated as an intellectual pioneer by the very schools upon which he turned his back. The *Winckelmannsfeste*, founded by the Archaeological Institute at Rome, and held by nearly all the German universities, pay an annual tribute to his memory. And it is worthy of note that the programmes of these festivals, already forming a valuable collection of scientific observations, generally deal with material, rather than literary, aspects of classic learning. They are not such essays as Winckelmann himself wrote, but such as he would have written. Papers like that by Doerpfeld and his colleagues on the employment of terra-cotta revetments in Greek architecture, or that by Adler on the original form of the Pantheon, are certainly an incomparably rich fruit of Winckelmann's *Remarks on the Architecture of the Ancients*.

This latest contribution, having for its subject the Ionic capital, takes good rank amongst its predecessors. In a short introduction the writer has himself characterized the plan of his work. It is neither a laudatory discourse upon one of the most attractive creations of Greek art, nor a revision of the many theories which have from time to time been advanced to explain the origin of the volute; it is, in the main, a critical treatise, in which the Ionic capitals hitherto brought to light are classed according to the age and geographical distribution of the various types. To facilitate this classification the conventional forms of the member are at the outset defined according to the description given by Vitruvius. The usual method of the historian of Greek architecture is thus reversed. Hereby much has been gained. No previous writer has succeeded so well in separating the diverse renderings of this decorative motif into groups, or in determining the influence which certain prominent and individually excellent

forms have exercised upon the Ionic capitals of the later Greek and Roman styles. Thus, to take a single instance, the most familiar and in many ways the most important type, we can trace the transformation of the capital of the Athenian Propylaea—undoubtedly to be ascribed in considerable part to the creative genius of Mnesikles—through imitations more or less close in the temple upon the Ilissos, the prostylos of Nike Apteros, and the greater and smaller Propylaea of Eleusis, to its utter debasement in the aqueduct of Hadrian. It may be remarked, parenthetically, that the capital of the Philippeion at Olympia, which Puchstein designates as a second Peloponnesian type, appears in like manner to be directly dependent upon the Athenian model. This form of capital, to be called the Mnesiklean, is of peculiar interest to us, inasmuch as it was that which, in its debasement, was chiefly imitated by the Italian architects of the Renaissance, and is even to-day in most common use. The present work does not provide us with materials for tracing the origin and growth of the Ionic capital of the Romans, which Puchstein evidently considers to have been based upon the Asiatic style of the Diadochi rather than upon any more immediate transformation of the Attic. He finds in the third book of Vitruvius internal evidence which, it must be admitted, makes it probable that the account of the Ionic style given by the Roman *maestro muratore* was taken in considerable part from some treatise written by Hermogenes, the architect of the temples of Magnesia and Teos. Hence it is argued that the description of the capital, given in the fifth chapter, corresponds to the Asiatic type, which was itself more closely related to the Mnesiklean form than Puchstein appears to have recognized. In the lack of adequate information concerning the first of these two monuments, and of trustworthy illustration of the second (the drawings of the Teos capital given by Revett and Pullan being altogether dissimilar), this hypothesis is not capable of definite proof or refutation. Nevertheless the Hellenic debasement of the Propylaea capital, such as that of the Philippeion, or that which subsequently appeared in Athens upon Hadrian's aqueduct, bears sufficient resemblance to the Ionic capital described by Vitruvius to warrant the belief that it was the Attic rather than a more remote and much less independent form of this member which served as a model to the Roman imitators of Greek architectural details. Historical as well as technical arguments might be adduced in support of this view.

Puchstein seems to the reviewer to have employed a truly Procrustean method in dealing with the dimensions of the Attic capitals of this series. In the endeavour to prove them to have been designed in accordance with the Attic foot of 295.7 mm., divided into sixteen daktylys, he subjects the actual measurements to a distortion which in certain cases alters the lengths and heights by fully one-tenth of their total amount. The given tables of the sizes of the capitals of Athens and Eleusis contain over forty

measurements—not a single one of which agrees absolutely with its hypothetical length, as calculated from units of the Attic foot. The ascertained dimensions are accordingly adjusted to suit the theory. As the calculation is based upon the daktyl, or occasionally even the half-daktyl, equal to little over nine mm., and as the known figures are altered in some cases by as much as eleven mm., a very complete table of ancient units is the result. In the aesthetics of architecture units of measurement and systems of proportions are dangerous playthings!

It is however in the references to the history of the development of the perfected Ionic capital of the Greeks that the author seems most at fault. This is perhaps a disadvantage of the novel method of treatment, the inverse of the historical, which in respect to the classification of contemporary examples has unquestionably led to such good results. To touch upon a single point: all connection is denied between the more familiar archaic type and the capital with upright volutes, examples of which have been found in Cyprus, in the Troad, in Lesbos, and, most recently, among the remains upon the acropolis of Athens antedating the Persian invasion. This is done upon the untenable ground that the horizontal spiral is a purely linear ornament, while the vertical spiral is nothing more than a floral form in linear presentation. It is impossible to admit this artificial distinction. No more striking disproof of such a theory could be desired than the Ionic capitals of the two types, found during the past year side by side, and published by Borrmann in the last issue of the *Antike Denkmäler*. There is nothing whatever in the treatment of these characteristic examples to indicate that any distinction was made by the archaic designer between the two forms, or that the one was of floral while the other was of linear origin. There is nothing which could tend to prevent an assimilation of the two types through the combination of their various advantages. Puchstein maintains that the *canalis* of the horizontal variety could not have been derived from a transformation of the upright volutes, as the juncture of the helices, cutting through the central palmetto, would contradict the regular and consequential development of Greek architectural forms. The fallacy of this argument will be made clear by a comparison of the archaic or provincially archaistic capital of the Lycian Antiphellos (Fig. 26 in the present essay), which, with its inorganic juncture between the volutes and its displaced anthemion, illustrates a stage of evolution precisely intermediate between such capitals as that of Neandrea (Fig. 46) on the one hand, and such as that surmounting the votive column of Alkimachos (Fig. 6) on the other. Let the volute and anthemion of the proto-Ionic capital be derived as they may,—whether from Assyrian sources, through Cappadocia, Phrygia and Phoenicia, or from ornamental renderings of the Egyptian lotus, as is maintained in a paper by Goodyear (Egyptian origin of the Ionic capital and of the Anthemion, in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, July—Dec., 1887), published subsequently to Puchstein's essay,—it is plain that both the vertical and horizontal varieties are to be placed in the same rank, and that it was solely through the combination of a projecting kyma with the volutes, common to both, that the Greeks developed those inimitable masterpieces—the Ionic capitals of the Athenian Propylaea and Erechtheion.

JOSEPH THACHER CLARKE.

THEOCRITUS IDYLL VII. HALEIS AND PYXA.—Among the inscriptions I have met with here, and

which I hope to publish shortly, are three which give us information about the places mentioned in the 7th Idyll of Theocritus. The first, found in the village of Pyli,¹ is a resolution, in which a gold crown is conferred upon a physician by 'τοὶ κατοικοῦντες ἐν τῷ δάμῳ τῶν Ἀλεντίων καὶ τοὶ ἐνεκτῆμένοι καὶ τοὶ γέωργοι ἐν Ἀλεντί καὶ Πέλῃ.' Πέλη is obviously the ancient form of the name of the village now usually written Πηλί. Πέλη formed part of the deme of Haleis. Haleis proper—the village or district which gave its name to the deme—is evidently to be sought in the plain near the *Halike* or Salt-lake: the whole territory of the deme probably corresponded roughly to that of the modern village.

Theocritus and his two friends were walking to Haleis. They had not gone half way when they met Lycidas, who accompanied them for a short distance and then turned to the left, and went on to Πόξα. Beneath the village of Asphendiu, at the spot where the high-road crosses the second river to the E. of the Halike, I found two tomb-stones erected by the 'δῆμος ὁ Φυζιωτῶν.' It is probable that the deme of Φύζα was continuous with that of Ἀλεῖς, and that its territory included the hill-village of Ἀσπένδιος (evidently an ancient name) and the plain to the E. of the salt lake. The spot where Theocritus and Lycidas parted must have been situated in this deme, so we must suppose that there was a village of Φύζα which gave its name to the deme, and which lay to the S. of the direct road to Haleis. Should we restore Φύζας for Πόξας in the text of Theocritus (vii. 130)? I have no access here to the Scholiast, who, it seems, gives us some information.

I should like to be able to identify the paradise described in the beautiful lines at the close of the poem. It may have been to the N.W. of the hill marked 680 ft. in the chart, where there is a spring abundant enough to turn a mill in the summer time. But neglect has robbed the site of its charm, for the water, formerly carried away by an aqueduct, has been allowed to stagnate in the low ground to the N., and now in order to realise the description of Theocritus we must go up to the lovely villages of Pyli, and Asphendiu, where we still find, not indeed wine to make Polyphemus dance, but multitude of running waters, and the deep shade of ancient trees.

COS, June 25.

W. R. PATON.

[The Scholiast to l. 130 says of Πόξας: Πόξα δῆμος τῆς Κῶ, ἣ τόπος οὕτως ὀνομαζόμενος, παρὰ τὴν φύξιν τοῦ Ἡρακλείους τὴν ὑπὸ τῶν Κῶν γενομένην. Another Scholiast says: οἱ μὲν τὸν ἐν Κῷ δῆμον οἱ δὲ τόνον, ἐν ᾧ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, ἀφ' οὗ Πόξιος λέγεται ἦγον τὴν ἐπὶ Πόξαν φέρουσαν ὁδὸν ἐβάδιζεν. ἡ Πόξα ὀνομαζόμενος, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Πόξιος Ἀπόλλων καὶ Πάν' ἦγον Φύζα τὴν ὄν. ἐκείθεν γὰρ ἔφυγεν Ἡρακλῆς, αἰφνης ἐπιθεμένων αὐτῷ τῶν Κῶν: so that the substitution of Φύζας for Πόξας in the text, as Mr. Paton suggests, is probably justifiable. As to Haleis, we are merely told that it might be either the place or the deme of that name in Kos: and the derivation is given variously as ἀπὸ τινος Ἀλεντος, ἀπὸ Ἀλεντίου τινὸς βασιλέως, and ἀπὸ Ἀλόντου βασιλέως. C. S.]

BRITISH MUSEUM.

The arrangement of the terra-cottas in the Room recently vacated by the collection of Glass and Majolica is now nearly completed; and the Old Print Room, which is intended for the exhibition of the fine collection of Greek and Roman reliefs, is undergoing the necessary alterations. The floor of the new Room, which it is hoped will be finished by the

¹ Refer throughout to the Admiralty chart of the island.

new year, will be on the same level with that of the Elgin Room, from which it will be entered: the present windows in the west wall will be done away with, suitable skylights taking their place.

ACQUISITIONS OF BRITISH MUSEUM.

1. A series of thirty-four vases from excavations in Cyprus, presented by Colonel Falkland Warren, R.A., and consisting of the following classes:—

a. Vases of dull red unglazed ware of the so-called 'Hissarlik' type: the surface has sometimes a rough hand polish: the ornament is usually raised and consists of geometric patterns of lines, zigzags, &c. The principal specimens of this class are two large bowls, such as are still used in the island for standing milk in, with spout and rudimentary handle: one specimen is in the form of a cow's horn, pierced for suspension.

b. A vase of the same character, with geometric patterns formed by incised dots and lines.

c. Vases of finer technique, of which the surface takes a very high polish: mostly of a brilliant red ware, which in some cases becomes brownish-black, and in two instances has a deep lustrous black, which appears to depend on the degree of baking: the ornament consists of incised lines and circles. It seems probable that the black specimens of this ware, which resemble the finest Wedgwood pottery, and of which the clay is black all through, are the immediate ancestors of the Bucchero or Polledrara ware, one branch of which seems to have been localised in Mytilene, judging from the inscribed fragments of it from Naukratis now in the British Museum.

d. An askos on three feet, with geometric patterns painted on it.

All the above are from one series of tombs at Paraskeui, and are probably nearly contemporary: they represent the earlier classes of Cypriote pottery.

e. An oinochoe, similar to class *c*, of fine black polish, decorated with an archaic serpent in relief: probably also from Paraskeui.

f. An oinochoe of drab ware of a late period: from Karpas.

With the above series came specimens of mosaic tesserae from Curium.

2. A bowl of red Roman ware, with stamped designs of Venus seated to r. alternately with Silenus standing to r. and playing on double flute: from Auvergne.

3. *a.* A marble altar of cylindrical form, decorated with a festoon of flowers in relief, supported upon four bulls' heads: inscribed in letters of a good period $\text{ΟΔΑΜΟΣ} \text{////}$: from Knidos.

b. A similar altar, encircled with a snake carved in relief: also from Knidos.

c-e. Three fragments of a large marble sarcophagus carved with reliefs which may have represented the labours of Herakles: on one of these fragments is the upper part of a figure carrying an animal on his shoulders: on another are the feet of a human figure and a boar's head.

f, g. Two fragments of a sarcophagus with a relief finely carved, representing a partridge among flowers and grapes.

h. An object in marble, rudely carved in the form of a bearded head (?).

i. Marble hinge of a rock-tomb door.

k. A fictile oinochoe of the Roman period, decorated with a garland in relief.

The above are all from the ancient Lydæ or Lissai (see *C.R.* 1888, p. 189).

l. Stone dowel from the drum of a column: from Thasos.

m, n. Iron hammer and lead tool, found on the site of the temple at the marble quarry of Thasos.

o. Fragment of a large fictile pithos, showing the method of construction upon a framework of lead: from Thasos.

p. Marble fragment of the hand of a colossal statue, giving the tips of two fingers: from Thasos.

q. A series of objects in terra-cotta, including nine amphora handles: from Samothrace.

4. Scaraboid from Tarsus, with intaglio representing a youth stooping to fasten his sandal.

5. Terra-cotta statuette of Pan, found at Tanagra.

6. *a, b.* Ivory knife-handle and saw, from Smyrna.

c. Garnet intaglio with Indian design and Greek letters.

d. Stone lamp, from Sardes.

e. Foot of bowl of red ware, with stamped designs; male figure standing between two busts: from Alexandria.

f. Bronze bezel of ring with intaglio: male head to left: from Beyrût.

7. A series of antiquities obtained by Mr. Flinders Petrie in the necropolis of Hawara in the Fayoum, and presented to the Museum by Jesse Haworth, Esq.

a. A series of limestone slabs and fragments, with inscriptions, principally sepulchral.

b. A series of fragments of wooden tablets prepared with wax and partly inscribed with late Greek characters.

c. Terra-cotta vase for holding crocodile food, as is shown by the Greek inscription painted on it.

d. Five terra-cotta vases and coins found with them.

e. Three terra-cotta incense burners.

f. Stone incense burner.

g. Sixteen terra-cotta vases of Ptolemaic and Roman periods.

h. Fragment of ware which has been decorated in blue and purple glaze: this would seem to be Arab, were it not from a cemetery where there is no Arab work of any kind: a piece of similar coloured ware, Mr. Petrie informs me, was found in a house at Nebesheh of the Ptolemaic period, together with coins.

i. Large terra-cotta arphora.

k. Small figure of Cupid in lead.

8. A second series from the same site as No. 7, presented by H. Martyn Kennard, Esq.

a. A mummy with the face covered by the portrait of a girl, painted on a thin cedar-wood panel: an excellent example of Greek encaustic painting of the third century, A.D. The Oriental Department has acquired from the same source an excellent specimen, of which the mummy case is in red with Egyptian ornamentation and an inscription $\text{Ἀρτεμιδωρος εὐψύχι}$ in gilt.

Revue Archéologique. March—April, 1888. Paris.

1. Darin and Héron de Villefosse: statuette in white clay from Caudébec-Lès-Elbeuf: plate. 2. Clermont-Ganneau: Sarcophagus from Sidon representing the myth of Marsyas: with epitaph of Imperial period: two plates. 3. de Launay: geological history of Lesbos and Thasos: two maps. 10. Reinach: list of Roman oculists mentioned on stamps. 11. Flouet: the god with the hammer: cut.

C. S.

The same. May—June, 1888.

1. Collignon: marble head from Tralles in the Constantinople Museum: plate. 2. Deloche: signet rings of the Merovingian period. 3. de la Blanchère: slabs of terra-cotta with painted reliefs, found in Africa. 5. Goutzwiller: the Venus of Mandeure. 7. Reinach: Chronique d'Orient. Bibliography.

C. S.

Gazette Archéologique. Nos. 3—4. 1888. Paris.

1. Maury: the bronze situlae of the museums of Este and of Bologna: plate and cut. 3. Podschialow: bronze amphora-handle with mask of Medusa in the Hermitage Museum: plate. 4. Theoxenou: excavations on the Akropolis at Athens: three plates (the bearded bronze head, and three archaic statues of women). C. S.

The same. Nos. 5—6.

1. Theoxenou: excavations on the Akropolis at Athens: plate (marble head of a woman). 3. Deglane: the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine: plate (reproduction of Piranesi's plan, 1787). C. S.

Athenische Mittheilungen. 1888. Athens.

1. Schuchhardt: the Macedonian colonies between Hermos and Kaikos: three cuts. 2. Mommsen: relief from Kula: cut. 3. Humann: the hill of Tantalos on Sipylus: plate (view of the Tantalids, and the Kybele statue on Sipylus), and seven cuts. 4. Cichorius: sixty-two Greek inscriptions from Lesbos. 5. Judeich and Dörpfeld: the sanctuary of the Kabiri at Thebes: (a) the plan of the shrine (with sketch map): (b) the temple (with plate and four cuts). 6. Dörpfeld: the stoa of Eumenes in Athens. 7. Lolling: inscription from Pharsalos. 8. Wolters: archaic inscription from Boeotia: and fragment of an Athenian painted cup: cut. 9. Record of excavations at Athens, Thebes, Ikaria, and Mantinea. C. S.

Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma. 1888. Roma.

Part IV.—1. Lanciani: notes on ancient buildings affected by the operations of the Board of Works in Rome. 2. Gatti: record of inscriptions, &c., found in Rome. 3. Guidi: bibliography: reviews of three archaeological books published in Rome.

Part V.—1. Huelsen: three views of the ruins of the Forum Romanum, drawn by Martin Heemskerk (1478–1574), with three plates. 2. Lanciani: notes on ancient buildings, continued. 3. Gatti: record of inscriptions, &c., found in Rome: in the Forum Romanum have been found the remains of a triumphal arch, erected in honour of Augustus A.U.C. 734: and in the cemetery of Priscilla (via Salaria) an hypogeum of early form, which had been decorated with marbles and mosaics: with inscriptions showing that it belonged to nobles of the gens Aelia. 4. Visconti: antiquities found in Rome: including statues of Jupiter, Aesculapius (probably a copy of a famous type), Mercury, Bacchus, and Cupid (Alexandrine): an Egyptian priest, and Apollo: and several statues from other sites. C. S.

Archaeological Institute of America. Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Volumes II.—III. The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor, by J. R. Sitlington Sterrett. Boston 1888.

A list of 651 inscriptions, collected by the author during tours made by him in 1884 and 1885 in ancient Cilicia, Lycaonia, Isauria, and Pisidia: with two maps, made from his observations and measurements by H. Kiepert.

Volume IV. Boston, 1881.

1. Miller: the theatre of Thorius: preliminary report: seven plates. 2. Cushing: the theatre of Thorius, supplementary report. 3. Allen: Greek verification in Inscriptions. 3. Crow: the Athenian Pnyx: with a survey and notes by J. Th. Clarke. 5. Lewis: notes on Attic vocalism. C. S.

American Journal of Archaeology. 1887. vol. iii. Nos. 3, 4.

1. Emerson: the portraiture of Alexander the Great (continued): explains the analogy of Alexander heads to certain Triton and Giant heads by a tendency in the art of the Diadochi which evolved out of mythology this un-hellenic type as suitable to a prince of barbarian race: two plates. 2. Merriam: painted sepulchral stelae from Alexandria: plate. 3. Good-year: Egyptian origin of the Ionic capital and of the Anthemion: demonstrates from early vases of Cyprus, Melos, &c., and from comparison with the Assyrian Proto-Ionic, which, like the Assyrian rosette, and most of the floral forms of early Greek vases, are lotus derivatives: twelve plates. 4. Merriam: Greek inscriptions published in 1886–7. 5. Marquand: the silver patera from Kourion in New York, compared with the Palestrina example: plate. 6. Ward: notes on oriental antiquities. 7. Ramsay: antiquities of Southern Phrygia and the border lands. 8. Schreiber: notes from Italian museums: two plates. Correspondence. News. Summary of discoveries, &c. C. S.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. 1888. Vol. ix. No. 1.

1. Cecil Smith: two vase pictures of sacrifices: the fragment (B. M. Cat. 804*) is a sacrifice to Athene, with perhaps the signature of an artist: and a suggestion for the Selene of the Parthenon: two plates, one cut. 2. P. Gardner: Hector and Andromache on a r.f. vase: mythical scenes on vases: cut. 3. Ridgeway: metrological notes: (a) the stadion, anciently called ἄλλος, was the length of the furrow in ploughing: (b) the Roman system of money (pecunia) was like the Greek, based on the ox. 4. Farnell: some museums of northern Europe: notes made on a recent tour in Copenhagen, Stockholm, St. Petersburg: one plate, three cuts. 5. P. Gardner: countries and cities in ancient art: represented by (a) guardian deities, (b) eponymous figure or founder, (c) allegorical figure, (d) a Tyche or Fortuna: plate. 6. Bent: discoveries during a recent cruise along the south coast of Asia Minor: two cuts. 7. Hicks: two decrees of Lissae, and a new artist's name from Anaphe, discovered by Mr. Bent. 8. Bury: the Lombards and Venetians in Euboea. 9. Harrison: archaeology in Greece, 1887–8. Reviews. C. S.

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique. May—June, 1888.

No articles on classical numismatics. The prices realised at the sale of the fine Quelen collection of Roman coins are given, pp. 269—279.

Zeitschrift für Numismatik, vol. xvi. Parts 1 and 2, 1888.

A. Von Sallet, 'The acquisitions of the Royal Coin-cabinet from April 1, 1887, to April 1, 1888.' Of the 781 specimens acquired, 99 belong to the Greek, and 8 to the Roman series. Among these are:—1. A unique tetradrachm of Samothrace with the types, Head of Pallas and Kybele seated, as on the didrachms. 2. A rare bronze coin of Saumacus, probably a Scythian dynast of the period of Mithradates VI. (obv. Head of Helios. Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ Thunderbolt). 3. A new denomination (didrachm) of the silver coinage of Stratonicea in Caria (obv. Head of Zeus. Rev. Artemis holding torch). 4. Bronze coin inscribed KET formerly attributed to Ceramus

in Caria, but now to Etenna in Pamphylia. 5. A rare bronze coin of Dioclea in Phrygia (*obv.* Elagabalus. *rev.* Demeter standing). 6. Important additions to the Bactrian series, including an unpublished silver coin with an obverse relating to Archelaus, and a reverse to Philoxenus, showing that these rulers were contemporary. — Rhousopolos, *Περθαλοι*: a new mint. A bronze coin in the Berlin collection thus inscribed: (*obv.* Head of Zeus, *rev.* Fore-part of horse springing from rock). The *Περθαλοι* were hitherto only known from a mention in a Thessalian inscription.

Review.—Von Sallet's *Beschreibung* of the Berlin collection, vol. i., by R. W.

WARWICK WROTH.

The Numismatic Chronicle, 3rd ser. vol. viii. pt. 2, 1888.

J. P. Six, 'Monnaies grecques, inédites et incer-

taines,' pp. 97-137. (1) Phlius, (2) Pheneus; Thaliadae. M. Six proposes new attributions of archaic coins to Phlius and Pheneus. (3) Tissaphernes; Orontes. A well known silver stater in the British Museum (Head's *Guide to the Coins of the Ancients*, pl. xix. no. 27) with a portrait-head in Persian head-dress (Reverse, ΒΑΣΙΛΥΡΕ) generally attributed to Colophon is given by Six to Iasos in Caria, and he sees in the portrait the famous satrap Tissaphernes. (4) Issos. (5) Cyprus. (6) Baalam King of Citium; Baalmelek II. (7) Sabaces satrap of Egypt.—Reviews:—Sallet's 'Beschreibung' (Berlin coin cabinet), vol. i., by B. V. Head; Giel's 'Kleine Beiträge zur antiken Numismatik Südrusslands,' by W. Wroth.—Miscellaneous: 'Find of Roman coins on Great Orme's head,' 17 coins of Gallienus, Victorinus, Tetricus and Carausius.

W. WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 4 Aug. review of Newman's *Politics*—18 Aug. review of Shute's *History of the Aristotelian writings*—25 Aug. note by F. W. Walker on root 'reb' in Latin; review of Roberts' *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*—15 Sept. review of Warr's *Echoes of Hellas*.

Academy: 23 June, review of King and Cookson's *Principles of Sound and Inflection in Greek and Latin* by Prof. Wilkins.—7 July, notice of school books and review of Rawlins' and Inge's *Eton Latin Grammar* by F. Haverfield.—21 July, review of three philological books by P. Regnaud, K. Bruchmann, and V. Henry by Prof. Sayce.—11 Aug. Prof. G. F. Browne writes further on the *Cod. Amiatinus*—25 Aug. notices of Using's *Plantius* III. 2. etc.

Rheinisches Museum, vol. xliii. part 2. contains:—

J. Bruns, *Lucian's philosophische Satiren*. II. 'Tracing the development of L's anti-philosophic vein.'—O. Crusius, *Συμπυκτοὶ Ἀνάπαιστοι*. 'A full anapaestic system but with certain feet replaced by pauses'—O. Apelt, *Gorgias bei Pseudo-Aristoteles und bei Sextus Empiricus*. 'The testimony of pseud-Arist. *de Melisso* &c. c. 5, 6, on G.'s work *περὶ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος ἢ περὶ φύσεως* is more valuable than that of Sextus Emp. (*Math.* vii. 65-87).' Proved chiefly by internal evidence.—K. Lugebil, *Zur Frage über die Accentuation der Wörter und Wortformen im Griechischen*. II. The tradition equally unreliable in the case of words out of use in, or later than, the Alexandrian epoch.—H. Nissen, *Die Abfassungszeit von Arrians Anabasis*. 'The first part later than 165 A.D., the second than 167 A.D.' Proof from the references to Lucian and to contemporary events.—R. Ellis, *De codice Priapeorum Vaticano* 2876.—F. Blass, *Demosthenische Studien*. Rhythmic law as a factor in critical emendation.—F. Buecheler, *Comiectanea*.—F. Schoell, *Ueber das Original von Plautus Rudens, nebst einigen weiteren epikritischen Bemerkungen*. 'Probably the Πύρα, mentioned as by Diphilus in a scholium (*cod. Paris. suppl.*, gr. 676).' Replies to Seyffert.

Miscellen:—

E. Rohde, *Ein griechisches Märchen*. The Greek version of the legend in Lang's *Custom and Myth*, pp. 79, 80.—O. Crusius, *De inscriptione Imbria versibus*

inclusa.—C. Wachsmuth, *Die Diabathra in Alexandria*. A new reference (in *cod. Paris. suppl.* gr. 676) with conclusions from it.—E. Wölfflin, *Atellanen und Mimentel*. On the suffix *arius*, and the use of class-names in the singular.—G. Amsel, *Eine Erwähnung Catulls bei Nokter*.—B. Barwinski, *De Dracontio Catulli imitatore*. 'Dracontius had read at least the *epithalamium Thetidis*.' Parallels quoted.—M. Hertz, *Der Name des ersten Römischen Geschichtschreibers aus dem Stande der Freigelassenen*. 'L. Voltacilius Pitholaus.' Ref. to Suet. *Rhet.* 3. Macrobian. *Sat.* II. 2. 13.—R. Hirzel, *Eine Synopse des Asconius*. Suidas s.v. *Ἀσκληῖος Μάρκος*.—B. Bunte, *Zu Tacitus Germania*, c. 40. 'nuitones is corrupt for uitones. Due to *w* being written *uu*.—*Etymologisches*:—1. Th. Aufrecht 'probus = pro-bo- $\sqrt{\theta e}$ cf. sense of *pradhāna*, 2. F. Vogel, 'vestibulum = vesti-stibulum = Vesta + stabulum.'

Philologische Rundschau, 1888.

1. A. Lange, *De conjunctivi et optativi usu Thucydideo* (Sitzler). A valuable contribution towards a grammar of the Greek Historians. Swoboda, *De Demosthenis quae feruntur proemia* (Fox). An attempt to prove (1) That the proems are all by one hand. (2) That they are by an author acquainted with and somewhat later than Demosthenes. Simon, *Xenophon-Studien* (Hansen). A thorough and careful inquiry into the use of a number of words in Xenophon. Gilbert, *Quaestiones criticae et exegeticae ad Ovidii Heroides* (Zingerle). Stimulating when not wholly convincing. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, Paulinus Petricordiensis, Petschenig, Orientius, R. Ellis, Paulinus Pellaeus, Brandes, *Victor and Proba* Schenkl (Baehrens). The reviewer finds the editors perhaps too conservative, and suggests other emendations. Luchs, *Emendationum Livianarum pars tertia* (Luterbacher). The author has carried still further his previous good services towards the third decade of Livy in these suggestions on books xxi.—xxv. Persson, *Studia Etymologica* (Stolz). An attempt to collect the Indo-European formations from the pronominal stem *ara*. The writer carries his theories too far. Tycho Mommsen, *Beiträge zu der Lehre von der griechischen Präpositionen* (Sittl). A continuation of his valuable work on *ὄν, παρά* and *ἀνά*. Richard Volkmann, *Gottfried Bernhardt* (Rettig). Excellent.

2. Fick, *Hesiods Gedichte in ursprünglicher Sprachform wiederhergestellt* (Sittl). Valuable, if for nothing else, at any rate as a stimulus to discussion of the subject. A. Holder, *Avieni Carmina* (xxx.) Gives a complete apparatus criticus, an accurate index, and a full list of previous writings on the subject. Kaerst, *Forschungen zur Geschichte Alexander des Grossen*. (Bauer). The most valuable contribution yet made to the discussion of the sources of the History of Alexander. Wecklein, *Sophokles Aias*, 2nd ed. (Fox). Both text and notes are carefully revised. The reviewer disapproves most of the readings suggested, and proposes some emendations of his own.

3. Vahlen, *Longinus de Sublimitate* (Brambs). Closely follows Jahn, but is more conservative. The reviewer approves the text as a whole, but criticizes a few of the readings. Mücke, *Zu Arrians und Epiktets Sprachgebrauch*, (Stich). Deals chiefly with the prepositions, and will be of use towards a grammar of the historians. Delbrück, *Die Perser-kriege und die Burgunder-kriege* (Bruncke). Indispensable to every student of Herodotus.

4. Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, (Mähly). The reviewer considers the translation below the level of the rest of the work, and dissents from Prof. Ribbeck's opinions on certain points, yet praises the work warmly as a whole.

Holder, *Herodoti Historiae*, Vol. II. (Schlichteisen). The spelling, as in Vol. I. is inconsistent. The criticism of the text is sensible, and perhaps too conservative. A few further emendations are suggested. Striller, *De Stoicorum studiis rhetoricis* (Mücke). A useful contribution to the history of Greek and Roman oratory. Zingerle, *Kleine philologische Abhandlungen* (Mohr). Contains (1) An account of an Innsbruck MS. of Juvenal. (2) Critical suggestions. (3) Quotations from the Latin bible in Hilarius. (4) Contributions to Lexicography chiefly from Hilarius.

5. Hodgkin, *The letters of Cassiodorus translated*, (Hasenstab). The translation is made not always quite correctly from an unsatisfactory text, still for general readers the work will have its worth. Kammer, *Untersuchungen betreffend Gesänge M, N, Ξ, O der Ilias* (Frey). The treatise contains much that is interesting and instructive, though the results of the criticism cannot always be accepted. Domaszewski, *Hygini grammatice liber* (Foerster). The edition, though open to objections in detail, marks a distinct advance. Günther, *Zeugnisse und Proteste über tragische Kunst*, (Thiele). Worthy of the careful consideration of all who are interested in the subject of Tragedy.

6. Simmons, *Ovidii Metamorphoseon* xiii. and xiv. (Zingerle). Is redeemed from being a mere school-book, partly by the collection of parallel passages, and chiefly by the new MSS. readings and conjectures contributed by Mr. Robinson Ellis.

Meier and Schoemann, *Der Attische Prozess neu bearbeitet von Lipsius* (Rettig). Is on the same level of excellence as the rest of the series, which it finally completes. Schneidawind, *Der Inhalts-accusativ in griechischen Prosaikern* (Sitzler). A useful contribution. Tiele, *Babylonisch-assyrische Geschichte* (Hansen). A careful and intelligent account containing all the more recent discoveries. Köstlin, *Geschichte der Ethik*. The work of a philosopher, who combines philological learning with historical method.

7. Cohn, *Zu den Parömiographien* (Sitzler). An account of several MSS. in Florence and Paris, giving many new and valuable readings and occasionally new proverbs. Schoendörffer, *De genuina Catonis de agri cultura forma*. Pt. I. *de Syntaxi Catonis*, (Heidrich). A careful and fairly complete analysis of the syntax of Cato, though some important points are overlooked. Stein, *Die Psychologie der Stoa*, Vols. I. and II. (Achelis). Warmly recommended.

8. Schmelzer, *Sophokles Tragödien, Philoctetes* (Müller). Interesting from a literary point of view, but critically untrustworthy. Schoell, *Plauti Captiv*, (Redslob). The reviewer while criticizing a large number of details, and suggesting alternative readings, fully recognises the great value of the edition. Ring, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, (Landgraf). The Paris MS., on which the text is based, is far superior to any other, but the editor is not equal to his task. The reviewer points out a number of defects and gives conjectures of his own. Sittl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf Alexander*, Vol. III. (8). Warmly recommended. L. v. Schröder, *Griechische Götter und Heroen, Aphrodite* (Curschmann). Connects Aphrodite with the Indian Apsaras and German Walkyren.

9. Weck, *Homeri Odyssea* 4-6 and 7-9 (Schirmer). Both the critical and exegetical notes contain many valuable suggestions. Schanz, *Platonis Opera, Sophista* (Nusser). The text is carefully based on the best MSS. B and T. The reviewer approves most of the readings suggested, and adds a few conjectures of his own. Sandys, *Ciceronis Orator ad Brutum* (Harnacker). Thorough and complete from every point of view. Zingerle, *Livy* i.-v. (Luterbacher). Attaches less value to the Medicean MS. than previous editions. The readings suggested are examined in detail. Duruy, *Geschichte Roms von Aktivum bis zum Einbruch der Barbaren* (pts. 25-43). On the same high level as the earlier parts. Funk, *Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum* (Rönsch). Perhaps the fullest and most complete of the many works on the subject. Bie, *Die Museen in der Antiken Kunst* (Weizsäcker). Useful and interesting.

Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxx. 1-3.

J. Wackernagel *Miscellen zur griechischen Grammatik* (continued) discusses (16) theory of consonantal assimilation, to prove that $\pi\mu$, $\beta\mu$, $\phi\mu$ after a long vowel become μ , after a short vowel are assimilated to $\mu\mu$, (17) $\eta\tau\tau\alpha$ (18) $\delta\mu\beta\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ as connected with $\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\acute{i}\omega\nu$, (19) passive aorists in $-\theta\eta\nu$, (20) $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omega$, (21) $\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$.—W. Meyer on the quantity and quality of Latin vowels, with reference to the Romance languages.—K. F. Johansson on $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ and its cognates.—R. Thurneysen: vocalic z becomes in Gk. δ after labials, elsewhere i .

Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique. VI. 4.

M. Bréal on two new Oscan inscriptions.—F. de Saussure: for $\sigma\omega\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ $\sigma\omega\phi\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$ in Hesych. read $\sigma\omega\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota$.—M. Bréal 'Phonétique syntactique,' and various etymologies.—L. Job: the Latin subjunctive in $-am$ which he would derive everywhere by analogy from $sistam$ when the \bar{a} is radical.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Aristophanes*, Three Plays of: The Politics of Aristotle: Virgil's Aeneid. Cr. 8vo. Routledge. 3s. 6d.
- Caesar*: De Bello Civili, an easy abridgment of, by H. Awdry, M.A. with maps and plans. 16mo. pp. 175. Rivington. 2s. 6d.
- The Gallic War, Books I. and II. edited by the Rev. Charles E. Moberly, M.A. 16mo. pp. 123. Clarendon Press. 2s.
- Demosthenes*: Oration on the Crown, translated, with notes, &c. by Charles Rann Kennedy. With a bibliographical introduction. Bohn's Select Library. 12mo. pp. 124. Bell and Son. 1s. 6d.
- Euripides*. Plays, with introductions by Henry Morley. Cr. 8vo. Routledge. 3s. 6d.
- Gellius*. Stories from Aulus Gellius: being selections and adaptations from the Noctes Atticae. Edited, with Notes, Exercises, and Vocabularies for the use of lower forms, by the Rev. G. H. Nall. 18mo. pp. 150. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Livy*. Book XXII. with Introduction and Notes by M. T. Tatham, M.A. 12mo. pp. 148. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Phaedrus*. Fables, Books I. and II. with an Introduction, Notes, and a Vocabulary. Post 8vo. pp. 90. Gill. 1s.
- Plato*, easy selections from. By Arthur Sidgwick. 16mo. pp. 152. Rivington. 3s. 6d.
- Raven* (J. H.) Latin Exercises, in the Oratio Obliqua. 16mo. pp. 95. Rivington. 1s. 6d.
- Tacitus*, Annals. Book I. with a literal interlinear translation by P. Meyer-Warlon. 18mo. pp. 108. Cornish. Sewed. 2s. 6d.
- Terence*, Comedies. Construed literally and word for word by Rev. Dr. Gill. Vol. I. The Andria and Eunuchus. 18mo. pp. 156. Cornish. Sewed. 2s. 6d.
- Xenophon*, Anabasis. Book II. edited for the use of Schools, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by A. S. Walpole. 18mo. pp. 98. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Anabasis. Book III. with Introduction, Notes, &c. by J. Marshall. 12mo. Clarendon Press. 2s. 6d.
- Anabasis, Selections from Book IV. Edited for the use of Schools, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. 18mo. pp. 106. Elementary Classics. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Anabasis, Book V. with map. 16mo. pp. 56-94, 6d.: with Notes and Vocabulary, 1s. Rivington's Greek texts.
- Cyropaedia. Book V. with literal interlinear translation by T. J. Arnold. 18mo. pp. 96. Cornish. Sewed. 2s. 6d.
- Hellenica, Book I. II. with Introduction and notes by G. E. Underhill, M.A. 12mo. 186. Clarendon Press. 3s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aars* (J.) Das Gedicht des Simonides in Platons Protagoras. (Aus Christiania Videnskabs Forhandling.) 8vo. 16 pp. Christiania. Dybwad. 70 Pf.
- Anselme* (M. d'). Du héros phénicien Cadmus et de sa famille. Vol. I. 8vo. x. 231 pp. Tours.
- Aristotle*. Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. XVII. 8vo. Berlin. Inhalt: *Johannis Philoponi in Aristotelis physicorum libros V. posteriores commentaria*, ed. Hieron. Vitelli. pp. 495-997. 19 Mk.
- Arnim* (H. von) Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria. VII. pp. 142. Berlin. Weidmann. 4 Mk.
- No. 11. Philol. Untersuchungen hrsg. v. A. Kiessling und W. Wilamowitz-Möllendorf.
- Becker* (R.) Sophocles quemadmodum sui temporis res publicas ad describendam heroicam aetatem adhibuerit. Pars I. 8vo. 92 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Berthelot* (A.) et *Didier*. Histoire intérieure de Rome jusqu'à la bataille d'Actium tirée des Römischen Alterthümer de L. Lange. Vol. II. 8vo. 774 pp. Paris. Picard.
- Blase* (H.) Geschichte des Irrealis im Lateinischen, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss des Afrikanischen Lateins. 8vo. iv. 79 pp. Erlangen, Deichert, Mk. 2.
- Boltz* (A.) Hellenisch die allgemeine Gelehrtensprache der Zukunft. 8vo. x. 325 pp. Leipzig. Friedrich. Mk. 6.
- Brandenburger* (I.) De Antiphontis Rhamnusii tetralogiis. 4to. 20 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 75 Pf.
- Brandt* (H.) Zur Erklärung des Sophocles. 4to. 48 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Bréal* (M.) Mémoire sur l'origine des mots fas, jus et lex. 4to. 11 pp. Paris. Extr. Mém. d'Acad. des Inscriptions.
- Bréal* (M.) et *Person* (L.) Grammaire latine élémentaire. 16mo. viii. 276 pp. Paris. 2 fres.
- Brinkmann* (B.) De Antiphontis oratione de choreuta commentatio philologica. 8vo. 78 pp. Jena. Pohle. Mk. 2.
- Brochard* (V.) Les arguments de Zénon d'Elée contre le mouvement. 8vo. 16 pp. Paris. Picard.
- Extr. Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des sciences morales et politiques.
- Canet* (V.) Les institutions d'Athènes. 2 vols. 12mo. viii. 656, 632 pp. Paris. Lefort.
- Cartault* (A.) La vie et les travaux de M. Eug. Benoist. 8vo. 32 pp. Extr. Instruction Publique. Paris.
- Chatelain* (E.) Paléographie des classiques latins Part VI. Horace. 15 plates. folio. Paris. Hachette 15 fres.
- Cicero*, Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino oratio, scholarum in usum ed. A. Kornitzer. 12mo. v. 72 pp. Wien. Gerold's Sohn. 60 Pfg.
- orationes pro T. Annio Milone, pro Q. Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro, scholarum in usum ed. A. Kornitzer. 12mo. vi. 116 pp. *ibid.* 80 Pfg.
- Cichorius* (C.) Rom und Mytilene. 8vo. 66 pp. 1 pl. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 2.
- Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta* ed. Kock. Vol. III. Novae Comoediae fragmenta. Pars II. comicorum incertae aetatis fragmenta; fragmenta incertorum poetarum; indices; supplementa. 8vo. xix. 756 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 16.
- Commentationes philologiae quibus Ottoni Ribbeckio sexagesimum aetatis magisterii Lipsiensis decimum annum exactum congratulantur discipuli Lipsienses. 8vo. iv. 557 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Contains 28 long and 18 short dissertations.
- Crinagorae* Mytilenaei epigrammata, ed. prolegomenis, commentario, verborum indice illustravit M. Rubensohn. 8vo. 124 pp. Berlin. Mayer and Müller. Mk. 3.

- Damocratis poetae medici fragmenta selecta*, ed. G. Studemund. 4to. 33 pp. Breslau. Koebner. Mk. 1.
- Declamatio in Lucium Sergium Catilinam*, eine Schuldeclamation aus der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Nach einer Münchener Handschrift des XV. Jahrh. hrsg. von Dr. H. Zimmer. Theil I. 8vo. 80 pp. München. Buchholz and Werner. Mk. 1.
- Dumont (A.) et Chaplain (J.) Les céramiques de la Grèce propre*. Vases peints et terres cuites. Vol. I. fasc. 4 and 5. 4to. Pp. 245, 420. viii. 20 plates. Paris. Didot.
- Favre (J.) La morale de Socrate*. 12mo. 332 pp. Paris. Alcan. 4 frs.
- Fedde (F.) Der Fünfkampf der Hellenen*. 4to. 40 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 2.
- Frachon (P.) De ephoris spartanis*. 8vo. 119 pp. Montpellier.
- Glossarium latinorum corpus*. Vol. II. Glossae latino-graecae et graeco-latinae edd. G. Goetz et G. Gundermann. Acc. minora utriusque linguae glossaria. 8vo. xlvii. 597 pp. 3 phototypic plates. Leipzig. Teubner. 20 Mk.
- Gomperz (Th.) Nachlese zu den Bruchstücken der griechischen Tragiker*. Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen. (Aus: Sitzungsberichte der k. Akad. d. Wissensch.) Lex. 8vo. 52 pp. Wien. Tempsky. 80 Pfg.
- *Zu Aristoteles' Poetik*. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik und Erklärung der Capitel I.—VI. (Aus: Sitzungsberichte der k. Akad. d. Wissensch.) Lex. 8vo. 42 pp. Wien. Tempsky. 70 Pfg.
- Goetz (G.) Questionum miscellarum pars II*. 4to. 8 pp. Jena. Neuenhahn. 50 Pfg.
- Gundermann (G.) Quaestiones de Juli Frontini strategematon libris*. (Aus: Jahrbuch für klassische Philologie. 16. Suppl. Bd.) 8vo. 57 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- Hahn (W.) Zeus in der Ilias*. i. 4to. 26 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Halpert (D.) Der Neid der griechischen Götter*. Eine psychologische Studie. 8vo. 16 pp. Breslau, Zimmer. 40 Pfg.
- Hecht (M.) Die griechische Bedeutungslehre*. Eine Aufgabe der Klass. Philologie. 8vo. 166 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 4 Mk. 40.
- Herodoti de bello persico librorum epitome*. In usum scholarum post A. Wilhelmii curam denuo ed. Franc. Laucizky. Adiunctae sunt librorum I.—IV. partes selectae. 12mo. xvii. 323 pp. Wien. Gerold and Sohn. 1 Mk. 80.
- Hertzberg (G. F.) Histoire de la Grèce sous la domination romaine*, traduite de l'allemand sous la direction d'A. Bouché-Leclercq. Vol. II.: d'Auguste à Septime Sévère, par A. Liebhaber. 8vo. 532 pp. Paris. Leroux. 10 frs.
- Hirzel (R.) Ueber die Stellung der classischen Philologie in der Gegenwart*. Akademische Antrittsrede, geh. in Jena am 5. Mai, 1888. 8vo. 35 pp. Leipzig. Hirzel. 60 Pfg.
- Hoffmann (O.) De mixtis graecae linguae dialectis*. 8vo. 72 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 60.
- Hoerschelmann (W.) Griechisches Lehrbuch der Metrik*. Literaturhistorische Studien. 8vo. 75 pp. Leipzig. Hinrichs. 2 Mk.
- Hosius (C.) Apparatus criticus ad Iuvenalem*, collegit et excussit C. H. 8vo. 118 pp. Bonn. Cohen u. Sohn. Mk. 3.
- Hotop (A.) De Eustathii proverbii*. (Aus: Jahrbuch für klassische Philologie, 16. Suppl. Bd.) 8vo. 64 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- Huber (I.) Die Ursachen der Verbannung des Ovid*. 8vo. 35 pp. Regensburg. Copenrath. 75 Pf.
- Jacobson (M.) De fabulis ad Iphigeniam pertinentibus*. 8vo. 54 pp. Königsberg. Koch. Mk. 1.
- Kaegi (A.) Zur griechischen Schulgrammatik*. 2. Artikel. 8vo. III., 94 pp. Berlin. Weidmann. 1 Mk. 20.
- Kampfenkel (O.) De Euripidis Phoenissae capita*. II. 8vo. 46 pp. Berlin. R. Heinrich. 1 Mk. 20.
- Kluge (H.) Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Ilias*. 8vo. VIII. 220 pp. Coethen. Schulze. 4 Mk. 50.
- Krafft (H.) Neue Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung lateinischer Autoren*. 4to. 18 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Krebs (I. Ph.) Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*. Nebst einem kurzen Abriss der Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache und Vorbemerkungen über reine Latinität. 6. Aufl. in vollständiger Umarbeitung der von Dr. Allgayer besorgten 5. Ausg. von Dr. I. H. Schmalz. 7-10. (Schluss) Lfg. Bd. 2. pp. 129-700. 8vo. Basel. Schwabe. 2 Mk. each.
- Kulturbilder aus dem klassischen Alterthum*. Bd. III. u. IV. 12mo. (Mit Illustrationen). Leipzig. Seemann. Bound. 3 Mk. each.—Contents: III. Die gottesdienstlichen Gebräuche der Griechen und Römer von O. Seemann. VI, 200 pp.—IV. Das Kriegswesen der Alten von M. Fickelscherer. VII, 234 pp.
- Lattman (H.) De coincidentiae apud Ciceronem vi atque usu*. 8vo. 116 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. Mk. 2.
- Ludwich (A.) Commentatio in Joanne Philopono grammatico*. 4to. 18 pp. Königsberg. Schubert and Seidel. 20 Pf.
- Lukas (F.) Die Methode der Eintheilung bei Platon*. In einer Reihe von Einzeluntersuchungen dargestellt. 8vo., xvi. 308 pp. Halle. Pfeffer. 6 Mk. 80.
- Lünburg (A.) De Ovidio sui imitatore*. Dissertatio inauguralis philologica. 8vo. 89 pp. Jena. Pohle. Mk. 2.
- Marguardt (I.) und Mommsen (Th.) Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*. Vol. III. pt. II. Römisches Staatsrecht von Th. Mommsen. Bd. 3. Alth. 2. XIV., pp. 833-1336. 8vo. Leipzig. Hirsch. Mk. 10.
- Menge (Rud.) et Preuss (Sigm.) Lexicon Caesarianum*. Fasc. V. Lex. 8vo. Col. 513-640. Leipzig. Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- Merguet (H.) Lexicon zu den Schriften Ciceros*, mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. Teil 2. Lexicon zu den philosoph. Schriften. Heft 2. (Lfg. 5-8). pp. 161-320. Lex. 8vo. Jena. Fischer. 8 Mk. each.
- Mie (F.) Quaestiones agonisticae imprimis ad Olympia pertinentes*. Commentatio. 8vo. 61 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 20.
- Milkau (F.) De Vellei Paterculi genere dicendi et quaestiones selectae*. 8vo. 100 pp. Königsberg. Nürnberg. Mk. 1.
- Miller (Th.) Euripides rhetoricus*. 8vo. 76 pp. Göttingen. 1887. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 Mk. 80.
- Müller (G. H.) Griechische Grammatik für Schulen*. 8vo. vii, 131 pp. Trier. Linz. 1 Mk. 20, bound 1 Mk. 50.
- Müller (M.) De Apollinaris Livonii latinitate*. Observationes ad etymologiam, syntaxin, vocabulorum apparatus spectantes. 8vo. 104 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 1 Mk. 50.
- Nothae (P. de). Les études grecques de Petrarque*. 8vo. 15 pp. Paris. Extr. Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscriptions.
- Opitz (G.) Scholiorum Aeschineorum qui fontes fuerint quare origo conlatis glossographis graecis exploratur*. Pars I. 4to. 19 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 90 Pf.

- Ovid.* Ex. Rud. Merkelii recognitione ed. R. Ehwald. Vol. I. 12mo. xli, 288 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 1.
- Παπαγεώργιος* (Π. Ν.). *Κριτικὰ καὶ παλαιογραφικὰ εἰς τὰ παλαιὰ Δισχόλου σχόλια.* (Aus Jahrb. f. class. Philologie. 16. Suppl. Bd.) 8vo. 27 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 1.
- Platonis* Laches. Scholarum in usum ed. J. Král. 12mo. xii. 36 pp. Prague. Tempsky. 40 Pf.
- Plautus.* Aulularia. Texte latin publiée d'après les travaux les plus récents avec un commentaire critique et explicatif et une introduction par A. Blanchard. 8vo. xii, 84 pp. Paris. Klincksieck.
- Plutarchi* Moralia rec. G. N. Bernadakis. Vol. I. 12mo. xcv, 421 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Poesis epicae graecae ludibundae corpusculum. Fasc. prior cont. parodiae epicae graecae et Arcestrati reliquias a P. Brandt editas. Acc. addenda ad fasc. alterum. 12mo. 228 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Pötzl* (K.). Die Aussprache der Lateinischen. Versuch einer praktischen Lösung dieser Frage auf wissenschaftl. Basis. Nebst einem Anhang über die Schulmethode. 8vo. 129 pp. Leipzig. Friedrich. Mk. 3.
- Prel* (C. du). Die Mystik der alten Griechen. (Tempelschlaf-Orakel-Mysterien-Dämon des Sokrates). 8vo. viii, 170 pp. Leipzig. Günther. Mk. 3.
- Pseudo-Castoris* excerpta rhetorica, edita a G. Studemund. 4to. 26 pp. Breslau. Koebner. 75 Pf.
- Reinach* (S.). Esquisses archéologiques. 8vo. viii, 319 pp. 8 plates. Paris. Leroux. 12 fres.
- Ritter* (C.). Untersuchungen über Plato. Die Echtheit und Chronologie der Platonischen Schriften, nebst Anhang: Gedankengang und Grundanschauungen von Platos Theätet. 8vo. xi, 187 pp. Stuttgart. Kohlhammer. 2 Mk. 50.
- Rothstein* (M.). Quaestiones Lucianae. 8vo. V, 140 pp. Berlin. Mayer and Müller. Mk. 3.
- Rove* (E.). Quaeitur quo jure Horatius in satiris Menippum imitatus esse dicatur. 8vo. 43 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 90 Pf.
- Ruppersberg* (A.). Ueber die Eirene des Aristophanes. 4to. 32 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften von J. Baunack, F. Bechtel, A. Bezzenberger, F. Blass, H. Collitz, W. Deecke, A. Fick, R. Meister, P. Müllensiefen, W. Prellwitz. Hrsg. von H. Collitz und F. Bechtel. Bd. 3. Heft. 2. 8vo. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 2 Mk. Inhalt. Die Inschriften von Korinthos, Kleonai, Sikyon, Phleius, und den Korinthischen Colonien bearb. von F. Blass, pp. 61—116.
- Schauenburg* (Ad.). De comparationibus Aristophaneis. Caput I. 4to. 20 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Schirlitz* (C.). Beiträge zur Erklärung der Platonischen Dialoge Gorgias Theaetetus. 4to. 31 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Schmidt* (I. O.). Ulixes Comicus. (Aus. Jahrb. f. class. Philologie. 16 Suppl. Bd.) 8vo. 31 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 1.
- Schmidt* (S.). Untersuchung über die Frage der Echtheit der Rede pro M. Marcello. 8vo. 124 pp. Leipzig. Fock. 2 Mk. 50.
- Schnorr von Carolsfeld* (H.). Ueber die Reden und Briefe bei Sallust. 8vo. vi, 81 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. Mk. 2.
- Schoemann* (G. F.). Antiquités grecques, traduites de l'allemand par C. Galuski. Vol. II. 8vo. 732 pp. Paris. Picard.
- Schöner* (C.). Studien zu Vegetius. 8vo. 44 pp. Erlangen, Metzger. Mk. 1.
- Schütte* (H.). Theorie der Sinnesempfindungen bei Lucrez. 4to. 25 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Schwarz* (E.). De M. Terentii Varronis apud sanctos patres vestigiis capita II. Accedit Varronis antiquitatum rerum divinarum liber XVI. (Aus Jahrb. f. class. Philologie. 16. Suppl. Bd.) 8vo. 95 pp. Leipzig. Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Schweizer-Sidler* (H.) and Surber (Prof.). Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Thl. 1, 2. gänzlich umgearbeitete Auflage der im J. 1869 erschienenen Elementar- und Formenlehre von Prof. H. Schweizer-Sidler. 8vo. xvii. 280 pp. Halle. Waisenhaus. Mk. 4.
- Sophokles.* Erklärt von J. Holub. II. Oedipus auf Kolonos. Mit einer topographischen Skizze. 8vo. xii. 92 pp. Paderborn. Schöningh. 1 Mk. 50.
- Stange* (O.). P. Papinii Statii carmina quae ad imperatorem Domitianum spectant, interpretatus est O. St. 4to. 38 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Steinberger* (A.). Die Oedipussage. Eine literarhistorische Skizze. 12mo. 78 pp. Regensburg. Copenrath. Mk. 1.
- Studien, Berliner für classische Philologie und Archäologie. Vol. VII. pt. 3. 8vo. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 2 Mk. 50. Beiträge zur griechischen Geschichte von Ludwig Holzapfel. 92 pp.
- Theophilo Antecessori* Institutionum graeca paraphrasis vulgo tributa, ad fidem librorum manuscriptorum rec., prolegomenis, notis criticis instruxit Prof. E. C. Ferrini. Accedit epistula C. E. Zachariae a Lingenthal. Cum versione latina. Pars II. Fasc. 2. 8vo. pp. 304—352. Berlin. Calvary and Co. 2 Mk. I.—II. 2: 17 Mk. 40.
- Tolkichn* (I.). Quaestium ad Heroides Ovidianas spectantium capita VII. 8vo. 131 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.
- Veckenstedt* (Dr. E.). Geschichte der griechischen Farbenlehre. Das Farbenunterscheidungsvermögen. Die Farbenbezeichnungen der griechischen Epiker von Homer bis Quintus Smyrnaeus. 8vo. xv. 204 pp. Paderborn. Schöningh. 3 Mk. 30.
- Viereck* (P.). Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque romanus magistratusque populi romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur. 4to. x, 122 pp. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. Mk. 5.
- Wagner* (A.). De syntaxi Propertiana. 8vo. 47 pp. Passau, Abt. 75 Pf.
- Walbe* (E.). Syntaxis Platonicae specimen. 8vo. 38 pp. Bonn. Behrendt. Mk. 1.
- Wallische*. Die Geschichtschreibung des Tacitus. 4to. 34 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 1.
- Welzel* (P.). Kallias, ein Beitrag zur athenischen Geschichte. 4to. 34 pp. Leipzig. Fock. Mk. 2.
- Wissmann* (F. G.). de genere dicendi Xenophonteo deque prioris Hellenicorum partis condicione quaestiones selectae. Dissertatio inauguralis. 8vo. 39 pp. Giessen. Ricker. Mk. 1.
- Xenophontis* commentarii rec. W. Gilbert. Ed. maior. 12mo. lxxx, 150 pp. Leipzig. Teubner.